

Lieut. Arthur G. Hall, October 1, 1928.
 Lieut. Ephraim Zoole, October 1, 1928.
 Lieut. Paul K. Perry, October 1, 1928.

To be lieutenants

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Alfred C. Richmond, October 1, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Walter R. Richards, October 1, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Thomas Y. Awalt, September 10, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Roy L. Raney, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) George B. Gelly, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Russell E. Wood, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clarence H. Peterson, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) James A. Hirshfield, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Joseph D. Conway, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles W. Lawson, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank T. Kenner, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) George C. Carlstedt, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) John Rountree, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) William W. Kenner, October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Stephen P. Swicegood, jr., October 17, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry C. Perkins, October 24, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Paul W. Collins, October 24, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles W. Thomas, October 24, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank A. Leamy, October 24, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) John H. Byrd, October 24, 1928.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Beckwith Jordan, October 24, 1928.
 The above-named officers have passed the examinations required by law.

To be lieutenants

Lieut. (Temporary) John McCann.
 Lieut. (Temporary) Charles Etzweiler.

To be an ensign

Ensign (Temporary) Dwight H. Dexter.

The above-named officers have met the requirements for appointment in the regular Coast Guard, as set forth in section 5 of the act of July 3, 1926.

APPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY
 GENERAL OFFICER

Brig. Gen. David St. Clair Ritchie, North Dakota National Guard, to be brigadier general, Reserve, from December 20, 1928.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Lieut. Commander William N. Richardson, jr., to be a commander in the Navy from the 11th day of December, 1928.

Lieut. Elliott M. Senn to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 16th day of October, 1928.

Lieut. Vernon F. Grant to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 16th day of November, 1928.

Lieut. Francis T. Spellman to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 11th day of December, 1928.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 16th day of October, 1928:

Cecil Faine.
 Hubbard F. Goodwin.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of December, 1927:

Gerald B. Ogle.
 John R. Sanford, jr.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 4th day of June, 1928:

Walter B. Davidson. Benjamin May, 2d.
 Roy R. Ransom. Alfred J. Benz.
 Arthur D. J. Farrell.

The following-named citizens to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 14th day of December, 1928:

Merrette M. Maxwell, a citizen of California.
 Jackson F. Henningsen, a citizen of New York.

Pay Clerk Walter W. Metcalf to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 3d day of December, 1927.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, January 3, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We pause at the threshold of the new year, Righteous Father; into the folds of the coming months we pass. We believe that Thou art ever nearer than the sky and all the worlds that roll in light. In the care of business, at the hearthstone with the children, at the cot when we wrestle for

our loved ones, we need not search for Thy presence, nor feel like an exile far from home. We thank Thee that Thou dost lift us to a knowledge of Thy love and protecting care, and that neither life nor death can change the manifestations of Thy heavenly providence. Oh, may the future glow with the glory of God. In the urgency of great duty or in the joy of a great purpose, may we feel ourselves allied to Thee. By simple honesty, by rejecting falsehood, by wise speech and brave example may we grow larger and better and become increasing forces in the affairs of state and society. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 22, 1928, was read and approved.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on December 22, 1928, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7324. An act for the relief of Orla W. Robinson.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On December 22, 1928:

H. R. 7324. An act for the relief of Orla W. Robinson.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10093. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Young, alias James Williams.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 584. An act for the relief of Frederick D. Swank; and

S. 4712. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right of way to the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. across the Benicia Arsenal Military Reservation, Calif.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. KEYES as a member of the committee of conference on the part of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 15089) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, vice Mr. CURTIS, excused.

AMERICAN TARIFF AND TRADE POLICIES

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on trade subjects and some tariff subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Republican proposal this year again to revise the tariff upward should be met by a Democratic challenge and demand to revise it downward. The Republican practice of accepting large campaign funds from tariff beneficiaries and later permitting them to come to Washington and write their own rates on the plea that the tariff must be revised by its "friends" should be met by a Democratic challenge and a demand that Congress, in the exercise of its own functions and prerogatives, shall write the rates. The Republican proposal to move farther in the direction of extreme high tariffs and more severe restrictions on international trade, in accordance with economic formulas and notions of the pre-war vintage, should be met by another Democratic challenge and a demand that America, instead of being further subjected to supertariffs, must in the future work toward a constructive and liberal tariff and commercial policy with uniformity of treatment, in the light of the transformation and revolution in our financial, industrial, and commercial affairs since 1914.

A correct interpretation of these new and changed postwar conditions clearly demands foreign markets rather than excessive tariff protection. There are certain new and elemental facts about America's domestic and international situation that can not well be ignored. From the economic standpoint the United States should have two main objectives, viz, the home trade and continuous development of foreign markets. The future prosperity of this country is inseparably bound up with both.

Republican leadership, ignoring the secure and impregnable position of American industry in our home trade and clinging to preconceived ideas of narrow nationalism or exclusiveness, would continue extreme protection, breathing retaliation, primarily at the behest of antiquated or inefficient plants, those

not economically justifiable, minor specialties, and those near seaports, where small but not abnormal imports come in. Foreign markets and foreign trade are no part of this single policy of superprotection and economic isolation.

The opposing view would put vitality into the recent utterance of President-elect Hoover that "international trade is the lifeblood of modern civilization," and would point to the extreme need of many great and increasing surplus-producing industries for foreign markets. It would brand as absurd the idea of formulating a broad, national tariff and commercial policy by singling out minor or local or group phases or individual tariff items and generalizing from them. It would insist instead that in solving our present vast industrial and trade problems, we must visualize the Nation as a whole—as one great financial unit, one giant productive plant with ever-increasing surpluses, and as the chief outstanding factor in the present interdependent and interlocked financial, commercial, and economic affairs of the world.

American economic policy can no longer ignore the fact that since 1914 we have changed from a debtor and small surplus Nation to the greatest creditor and actual or potential surplus-producing Nation in the world; that due not to tariffs but to our superior labor, machinery, horsepower, and to mass production we maintain higher wages and living standards and lower production costs in an increasing number of industries than any other country; that as a result we were able in 1927 to export and sell \$2,000,000,000 of finished manufactures and \$700,000,000 of semimanufactures throughout the world in defiance of all low wages and low living standards. Be it remembered in this connection that our high wages and high-living standards had become a permanent part of our industrial system prior to the Fordney tariff; that they originated in the automobile, the buildings, the railroad, and other nontariff sheltered industries, and that real wages here have increased not much over 2½ per cent since 1923. And, too, the great reduction of working hours was effected prior to 1921. Let it be further remembered that our high tariffs were not an important factor in such partially satisfactory business conditions as we have had. Our unlimited raw materials and foodstuffs, mass production, and increased productivity of labor, automobile expansion, our vast gold and credit structure, the expenditure of billions annually in building, highway, and railway construction and improvement, and the installment sales of two and three-fourths billion dollars per annum, have been the chief factors. The major effect of tariffs is to transfer wealth from one class to another without affecting the Nation's total.

It is safe to say that our productive capacity to-day is 25 per cent in excess of our ability to consume. High tariffs can not save us from growing surpluses. Some of the serious results already are the doubling and trebling of distribution costs in frenzied efforts to dispose of increasing surpluses at home; much idle labor and vast aggregations of idle capital, billions of which have gone into stock brokers' loans, for gambling purposes, thereby seriously affecting the stability of both our money and trade structure; many loans abroad made more hastily than prudence and good investment policy would justify; feverish efforts by many industries, through devices and tacit arrangements to curtail production so as to maintain an equilibrium between production and consumption, thereby avoiding price dislocation; a growing annual surplus in an increasing number of industries such as agriculture, coal, the textiles, oil, and a long list of others. If American plants to-day were unloosed at full production capacity, they would flood all domestic markets within 90 days, and many artificial parts of our economic structure would topple and fall.

It is my individual view that these glaring facts and conditions soon will compel America to recognize that these ever-increasing surpluses are her key economic problems, and that our neglect to develop foreign markets for surpluses is the one outstanding cause of unemployment. Those who champion our system of superprotection do not pretend that tariffs will aid exports, for the patent reason that nations can not sell more if each tries to buy less; that high tariffs shut off our exports almost to the extent that they shut out imports; that such tariffs arouse hatred, controversy, retaliation, and drive trade in the opposite direction; that we can not extend foreign markets by raising domestic costs; and that every tariff rate is an injury to export trade.

Since the war, with values equalized, our imports of finished dutiable manufactures have been less than in 1914. Our average tariff rate on these is approximately 42 per cent, while it runs to 53 per cent on cotton manufactures, 61 per cent to 71 per cent on woolen manufactures and fabrics, respectively, and 68 per cent on silk wearing apparel. Imports comprise the very minimum of competitive articles, while they involve billions of

noncompetitive raw materials and foodstuffs, we do not produce, or can not produce in sufficient quantities, semimanufactures, specialties, and certain costly fashions or designs purchased by the rich. If instead of teaching the people that the slightest imports are a matter of life and death we would teach them that there is room for a mutually profitable exchange of a large range of commodities that neither country can profitably produce, as just described, as well as still others only indirectly or remotely competitive, we would thereby derive \$3 from enhanced and healthy sales of our surpluses to each \$1 derived from ultra tariff protection. But people are taught to view only the gross tariff benefits and to overlook what are net tariff injuries in a majority of cases.

It was under American leadership that a network of tariffs has been built up in Europe since the war, with such results as diminished production, wasteful use of capital, uneconomic distribution of industries, serious trade controversies, and fatal handicaps to the restoration of international trade. America should now take the lead back toward lower tariffs and liberal trade policies. It would be absurd to call upon other countries to lower their tariffs while we proceed to raise ours, already far higher than theirs. There was never such potential trade opportunities in many countries open to a nation as are offered America to-day. There are more than a billion people in the Far East and in South America whom we could easily persuade to desire more and better things to eat, wear, and use, and who could soon be induced to develop a purchasing power of ten to fifteen billion dollars per annum. We have thus far scarcely scratched the surface. A similar course toward Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands by the United States, toward Africa by England, and Manchuria by Japan, are illustrations.

The conclusion is inescapable that this Nation, faced with large and growing surpluses, can advance its economic welfare to a far greater extent by developing these wonderful foreign-trade opportunities than by rejecting them for the sake of an air-tight tariff structure and the trifling increase of home trade resulting. To prove this we have but to look at the small increase of home trade and consumption compared with our great piling up surpluses since 1923. The latter course will send American agriculture and other surplus industries to their doom. Agriculture was given the so-called farmers' high tariff of May, 1921, with the assurance that it meant prosperity; they were later given the supplemental tariffs in the Fordney Act of September, 1922, with the renewed promise that they were the key to undoubted agricultural prosperity. Agriculture to-day is over \$20,000,000,000 worse off than in 1920. Still more tariffs are again offered agriculture. Can the same farmers be thus fooled a third time in succession? Our agriculture already enjoys all the tariff benefits available to a material extent, save as to a few minor products. Three hundred and thirty-nine million of a total of 356,000,000 acres planted to crops in 1927, comprised staple crops that experience purely nominal or no tariff benefits, but only tariff penalties. These include corn, cotton, tobacco, wheat, hay, rye, oats, buckwheat, and barley. Here is where the farmer's capital is invested. I agree now to pay \$500 to any charity, if any impartial group of unbiased economists to be selected should not find that the tariff injuries as a whole to the producers of these eight staple products are not three to five times greater than the tariff benefits. Almost the entire truck products, which are more clamorous for tariffs, are only raised on about 2,400,000 acres, or less than 4,500,000 acres, if we include peanuts and beet and cane sugar. To dose the farmer further on tariffs, save in a few minor instances, is but an attempt "to drug the patient while his strength slowly ebbs away." The farmer should follow economic rather than political leadership.

The United States along with Spain and Russia maintains the highest tariff and trade barriers in the world. Other nations have tariffs, deemed amply high, but they are low in comparison with ours. When Republicans assert that tariff protection has become the accepted policy in this country, they do not mean reasonable, or adequate, or moderate protection, but inordinate, air-tight, superprotection intended to exclude every item of imports remotely competitive, which invites retaliation, and which largely cuts us off from all markets for our surpluses. They dare not defend it upon grounds of revenue or equity or morals.

This is the first economic issue tendered to Democrats. We must first halt and drive back the movement to fasten this unsound and destructive policy of extremism upon the country, by a demand that the Nation face in the opposite direction of lower tariffs, more liberal trade policies, and systematic efforts to develop an increasing export trade. The latter should include free ports wherein raw materials could be brought from abroad, mixed with our own, and manufactured into finished products to be exported and sold.

Astonishing to say, our exports to-day are less than they would have been under the pre-war percentage of increase, although we have sold most of them on credit by loaning the money to pay for them. These loans with which to pay indebtedness due us from abroad can not continue. It is merely piling new upon old debts. The first objective then, of those who challenge the Republican tariff program, is to substitute the broader and more liberal tariff and trade policies as stated. The tariff readjustments to this end should be brought about in the most careful, gradual, and scientific manner. Under these policies our surpluses would be kept moving; labor and capital would be fully employed on thoroughly satisfactory terms; many raw materials we do not produce or can only produce in wholly inadequate quantities would be admitted free, thereby substantially reducing production costs; and soon our exports would aggregate ten to fifteen billion dollars instead of five billions at present.

Pending the accomplishment of this first objective, as I view it, there need be no occasion for quibbling or concern about the fixing of rates for minor tariff items where, due to changed conditions, imports are abnormal, the industry is efficient, and the rates are not on a parity with those of the general tariff structure. But when the first long step in this proposed tariff and trade policy of liberalization shall have been carried into effect, then under improved conditions will come the occasion to define and prescribe more exact formulas for rate purposes. When with lower production costs and wider and better foreign markets, tariff demands will be modified, the rate basis will be different and easier of determination. The modernized view that as a nation becomes economically independent it should throw off artificial restrictions upon production and trade, will be strong. Unreasonable fear of foreign competition and the present mania for tariff embargoes will have abated. The weight of enlightened opinion will incline more and more toward moderate tariffs, reasonably competitive, which would give play to an ever-increasing foreign trade, a healthier, greater, and better balanced home production and price level, with all standards of wages and of living maintained and gradually improved, a better distributed prosperity, and America for generations would lead the world in finance, industry, and commerce.

Our Government should have had installed since 1921 a great impartial and firm fact-finding tariff body—much freer from bias and factionalism than some of the commissions that have been attempting to function—to the end that Congress and the country might at each stage have been kept fully advised of all current industrial, trade, and economic facts material and pertinent for the purposes of tariff readjustments from time to time. With a responsive Congress, disposed to utilize and act upon conditions thus revealed, our economic situation to-day would have been far better.

This country could have utilized, as it could yet, the bargaining method, along with the unconditional favored-nation doctrine; but the former only as a present means of checking and gradually lowering many abnormally high tariff and trade barriers. Our country could also lend its moral influence, as it heretofore should, in the direction of gradual readjustment downward of excessive tariffs by all nations, and so participate either in concert, or separately and independently, in such downward movement.

The set of policies herein suggested offers the only alternative to that always practiced, though not always professed, by the Republican Party; which latter constitutes the most aggravated form of special privilege; which requires our economic structure, as far as may be, to rest upon subsidies made possible by legislation; and which, worst of all, involves a corrupt partnership between politics and vested industrial interests, the poison of which constantly breeds national scandal such as that in Pennsylvania. With this sinister and discredited policy there can be no compromise.

Moreover, the Democratic Party could not secure the favor of these forces of superprotection if it would. The Republican Party already is their willing and subservient agent, and they would be slow to incur the useless trouble and expense to debauch and prostitute another political party for the same purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address on religious liberty, delivered by William Jennings Bryan, at the Democratic convention held in Madison Square Garden, New York, four years ago.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, that is going pretty far, and I object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted to my colleague, Mr. HARE, of South Carolina, for five days, on account of serious illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BARBOUR, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 15712) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. COLLINS reserved all points of order.

REVISION OF THE UNIFORM GOVERNMENT CONTRACT BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, in the last session I introduced H. R. 5767, a bill to establish uniform requirements affecting Government contracts, and for other purposes; a bill which is of very general interest in the departments and to those who have business with the Government. Some hearings were held and then the bill, which was originally drafted in the Budget office by the interdepartmental board on contracts, went back to that board for further consideration. They have now agreed upon a new bill which I am introducing to-day, H. R. 15713. I should like to ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks very briefly and, in addition, to insert with my remarks the bill showing the changes made in it. As I have introduced it to-day it is in form an entirely new bill and it would be a great convenience to those who are following this legislation to have printed in the RECORD the bill with the amendments and changes indicated in the customary style, and with that a brief memorandum from the Budget office explaining the changes and amendments, as well as a letter from the Director of the Budget. I present that as a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House, headed by Congressman CHRISTOPHERSON. In those hearings numerous suggestions were made with reference to the bill and those suggestions have had extended study by the interdepartmental board. The numerous changes in the bill of more or less importance are recommended by that board and are embodied in the bill which I am now introducing.

I anticipate that Judge CHRISTOPHERSON's subcommittee will proceed with hearings on this revised bill in the near future. I regard the bill as one of very great importance in bringing about uniformity in the practice of the Government in its various departments and establishments in the making of contracts. Through such uniformity the work of the General Accounting Office will be materially simplified and due protection of the interests of the Government will be made more easy.

The letter from the Director of the Budget is as follows:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, December 29, 1928.

Hon. L. C. CRAMTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CRAMTON: On December 27, 1928, you wrote me with reference to the general Government contract bill (H. R. 5767) which you introduced December 5, 1927. Since the termination of the first session of the Seventieth Congress the Interdepartmental Board of Contracts and Adjustments has been actively engaged in reviewing the original bill, and, following your suggestion, has had hearings with Government officials and others who suggested certain changes in the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

As a result of this review work, the board has recommended certain changes in the original draft, which changes are indicated on the inclosed copy of bill H. R. 5767, as it was thought that you would desire to know exactly what changes were recommended. A complete redraft of the bill containing all of the changes recommended by the board is also inclosed, together with an explanatory statement relating to these changes.

The draft herewith submitted embodies the amendments that were deemed advisable by the board and I am informed by the board that the present draft in all material respects has the approval of the

departments and independent establishments of the Government, including the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and excepting alone the General Accounting Office. With regard to the General Accounting Office I am informed that the provisions of sections 7 and 9 are not concurred in.

There is one section of this draft to which I believe I should make specific reference, namely, section 9, which deals with liquidated damages, and as now worded confers upon the head of the department concerned the authority to remit the whole or any part of such damages as in his opinion may be just and equitable. The board advised me that this section had the unanimous approval of the departments and establishments, with the exception of the General Accounting Office.

I again presented this matter to the President, who has authorized me to state that he approves the draft as now presented by the Interdepartmental Board of Contracts and Adjustments.

Sincerely yours,

H. M. LORD, *Director.*

The bill showing the amendments of H. R. 5767 therein is as follows, and showing amendments by contract board, December, 1928:

A bill (H. R. 5767) to establish uniform requirements affecting Government contracts, and for other purposes

[Omit the part in brackets and insert the part printed in italics]

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "The public contract act, [1928] 1929."

SEC. 2. Definitions: When used in this act, unless the text indicates otherwise;

(a) The terms "United States" and "Government" are synonymous and include the District of Columbia and all departments of the Government;

(b) The term "department" means any executive department, independent establishment, commission, board, or other Government agency having authority to make contracts involving the expenditure of public funds, *and shall include the District of Columbia;*

(c) The term "formal contract" means an agreement reduced to writing in one instrument and signed by all the contracting parties at the end thereof. The term "informal contract" means an agreement in any other form;

(d) The term "advertising" means inviting competitive bids by notice in printed publications or posted in public places, by circular letter or otherwise;

(e) The term "general provisions" means those parts of a contract that deal with the general rights and liabilities of the contracting parties as distinguished from the provisions peculiar to the particular contract;

(f) The term "personal services" means services rendered at a specified rate in person by the party or parties who contract to perform them;

(g) The term "contractor" means any person, partnership, company, or corporation party to a contract with the United States;

[(h) The term "emergency and exigency" are synonymous and mean situations requiring such immediate action as not to permit advertising for bids and the execution of contracts;]

[(i)] (h) The terms "purchase" and "procurement" are synonymous and mean the acquisition of services, materials, or supplies pursuant to contract.

SEC. 3. Authority: No contract shall be made or obligation assumed on behalf of the United States unless the same is under appropriation adequate to its fulfillment except—

(a) By any department charged by law with the procuring thereof for clothing, subsistence, forage, quarters, shelter, transportation, medical, surgical, or hospital supplies, or services, which, however, shall not exceed the necessities for the current fiscal year;

(b) For fuel for Government use in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements for one year without regard to the current fiscal year, when, in the opinion of the head of the department charged with the procuring thereof, it is in the interest of the United States so to do. Payments for fuel delivered may be made from funds appropriated to such department for that purpose for the current fiscal year or from funds appropriated or that may be appropriated therefor for the ensuing fiscal year;

(c) By the Post Office Department for such periods of time as may now be authorized by law;

(d) Leases of real estate by departments for terms not exceeding three years, by the State department for premises in foreign lands for terms not exceeding 10 years, and by the Post Office Department for terms not exceeding 10 years, and by other departments for a term not exceeding three years; *such periods of time as may now be authorized by law: Provided, That no contract shall be made for the leasing of any building or part of building in the District of Columbia unless the same shall have been authorized by law or until an appropriation therefor shall have been made in terms by Congress;*

(e) For services or supplies in cases threatening immediate loss of human life or destruction of property;

(f) By the Indian Service as provided by section 4 of the act of August 15, 1894;

(g) By the Bureau of Fisheries for supplies for the natives of the Pribilof Islands in the manner and subject to the limitations provided in paragraph (b) of this section;

(h) When otherwise authorized by law.

SEC. 4. Purchase of land: No land shall be purchased on account of the United States except under a law authorizing such purchase.

SEC. 5. Advertising: (1) All contracts exceeding \$500 in amount for work, materials, supplies, or services, other than personal, shall be made after advertising for bids a sufficient time previously and not less than 10 days before the day set for the opening thereof; except—

(a) During the period of a national emergency when so declared by the President;

(b) When the public exigency will not admit of the delay incident to advertising;

(c) For medicines and medical supplies, hospital and surgical supplies, and prosthetic appliances when authorized in writing by the head of a department or by the head of the medical service of the department concerned;

(d) For articles for the military or naval or Coast Guard service, when the Secretary, Acting Secretary, or Assistant Secretary of the War, Navy, or Treasury Departments, respectively, personally certify that the character or ingredients thereof are of such a nature that the public interests require that they be kept secret;

(e) In purchasing fuel for the Navy or for naval stations and yards, the Secretary of the Navy shall have power to discriminate and purchase, in such manner as he may deem proper, that kind of fuel that is best adapted to the purpose for which it is to be used;

(f) For scientific and technical apparatus and instruments of precision for specialized laboratory or research work;

(g) For supplies purchased and to be used without the limits of the United States or its possessions;

(h) For products of Indian industry purchased from Indians under Government superintendence for Indians under Government supervision;

(i) For proprietary or other articles or services for which it is impracticable to secure competition;

(j) Supplies purchased for authorized resale;

[(k) For experimentation, development, and manufacture of special military or naval material for test to determine the suitability thereof for actual service.]

(k) For experimental or development work for the military or naval services, or for manufacture or purchase of military or naval matériel, for experimentation or test to determine the suitability thereof for actual service;

(1) When otherwise authorized by law.

(2) The advertisement or specifications shall clearly describe the needs of the Government in such terms as to permit full and free competition on such needs.

SEC. 6. Publication: No advertisement for bids shall be published in any printed publication except upon written authority or regulation of the head of the department concerned. The compensation for such advertising shall in no case exceed the commercial rates charged to private individuals, with the usual discounts, such rates to be ascertained from sworn statements to be furnished by the proprietors or publishers of such publications.

[SEC. 7. Opening bids: When bids are submitted in answer to advertisements, they shall be publicly opened at the time and place stated in the advertisement. Bidders shall be permitted to be present at the opening either in person or by representative. An abstract of all bids received shall then and there be made. Award shall be made with reasonable promptness and by written notice to that responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the specifications, will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. In case of doubt as to which bid is most advantageous to the Government, the decision of the head of the department shall be final: *Provided, however, That any and all bids may be rejected when it is in the public interest so to do.*]

Sec. 7. Award of contracts: All bids shall be publicly opened at the time and place stated in the advertisement. Award shall be made with reasonable promptness by written notice to that responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the specifications, will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered: Provided, That acceptance of any other than the lowest bid conforming to the specifications, or the rejection of any bid on the ground of the bidder's irresponsibility, shall be by the head of the department concerned, whose decision shall be final, and in each such case he shall file with the original contract a statement of his reasons therefor, an abstract of all bids received, and a copy of the advertisement: Provided further, That all bids may be rejected when it is in the public interest so to do.

SEC. 8. Forms of contract: Contracts for the construction or repair of public works or the procurement of materials, supplies, or services other than personal shall be formal, except—

(a) When the amount of the award is \$2,000 or less;

(b) When the amount is \$5,000 or less and performance or delivery is to be completed within 90 days;

(c) When the public exigencies require immediate performance or delivery; or

(d) When the supplies are to be purchased and used without the limits of the United States or its possessions;

(e) For the repair or overhaul of vessels.

In cases (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) the work, materials, supplies, or services may be procured by informal contract.

Sec. 9. Liquidated damages: Whenever, in contracts to which the United States is a party, there is a provision for liquidated damages for delay, the Comptroller General of the United States, on the written recommendation of the head of the department concerned, may remit the whole or any part of such damages that have accrued as, in his opinion, may be just and equitable.

Sec. 9. Liquidated damages: Whenever, in contracts to which the United States is a party, there is a provision for liquidated damages for delay, the head of the department concerned, stating his reasons in writing therefor, may remit the whole or any part of such damages as in his opinion may be just and equitable.

Sec. 10. Filing of contracts: [An] The original of each formal contract shall be forwarded to the General Accounting Office as soon as practicable. [An] The original of each informal contract shall be forwarded to the General Accounting Office with the voucher covering the first payment thereon. All contracts so forwarded shall be accompanied by the performance bond, if any.

Sec. 11. Copies of contracts: A certified copy of any contract and related papers filed therewith, in whole or in part, shall be furnished by the General Accounting Office to any person applying therefor, and paying in advance its estimated cost, but this shall not apply to any contract which the head of the department concerned has certified contains confidential or other matters which, in the public interest, shall not be disclosed.

Sec. 12. Payments: No payment shall be made under contract in excess of the value of the work performed, the services rendered, or the articles accepted, except that communication services, *subscriptions for printed publications, and rent, heat, and light in foreign countries, [and subscriptions for printed publications]* may be paid for in advance.

Sec. 13. Security: (a) Every formal contract with the United States for the construction or repair of public work shall be accompanied by a performance bond, with good and sufficient sureties, including the additional obligation that the contractor shall promptly make payments to all persons supplying labor or materials for such [contract] work. If no suit be brought on the bond by the United States prior to [within three] six months from and after final settlement under the contract, by the General Accounting Office, any other claimant under such obligation may bring suit in the name of the United States, for his use and benefit, in the [district] appropriate court of the United States for the district in which the contract was to be performed, irrespective of the amount in controversy, and not elsewhere, within [one year] 18 months after such settlement. Any claimant under such bond shall, upon application therefor and furnishing an affidavit to the General Accounting Office that he has supplied labor or materials for such work and payment has not been made therefor, be furnished, without cost, with a certified copy of said contract and bond, upon which he may bring said suit, and he shall also be furnished by the said office with a statement of the date that final settlement has been made under the contract, which statement of the date of settlement shall be conclusive upon the parties. Only one suit on such bond may be brought, whether by the United States or other claimant, and any other claimant under the bond, including the United States, may intervene in the suit and be made a party thereto not later than [one month] 90 calendar days after the date of the last publication of notice hereinafter provided for. Notice of the pendency of the suit, with information as to the right to intervene, shall be given personally or by mail, as the court may order, to all known creditors, and published in some newspaper of general circulation, published in the State, [or] county, or city in which the contract was to be performed, once in each of three successive weeks. If the full amount of the liability of the sureties on said bond is insufficient to pay all amounts awarded in such suit, the amount remaining after paying in full any amount awarded the United States shall be prorated among the judgment creditors. In any such suit the sureties on the bond may pay into court for distribution among all claimants the full amount of their liability under the bond, less any amount which they may have had to pay to the United States thereunder, and upon so doing they will be relieved from further liability;

(b) Performance bonds or other security may be required in cases other than those specified in paragraph (a) of this section;

(c) Any corporation having qualified, as required by law, to act as surety on bonds in which the United States is obligee, may be accepted as sole surety on any bond required or authorized under this act;

(d) Whenever any bond, guaranty, or undertaking, with surety or sureties, is required by this act, United States bonds or notes may be furnished as security [as provided by law].

Sec. 14. Hours of labor: Every contract on behalf of the Government, which may require or involve the employment of laborers or

mechanics, shall contain a provision that no laborer or mechanic doing any part of the work contemplated by the contract in the employ of the contractor or any subcontractor contracting for any part of said work contemplated, shall be required or permitted to work more than eight hours in any one calendar day upon such work, and every such contract shall stipulate a penalty for each violation of such provision in such contract of \$5 for each laborer or mechanic for every calendar day in which he shall be required or permitted to labor more than eight hours upon said work; and any officer or person designated as inspector of the work to be performed under such contract, or to aid in enforcing the fulfillment thereof, shall, upon observation or investigation, forthwith report to the proper officer of the Government all violations of the provisions of this section and the amount of the penalties imposed according to such stipulation shall be withheld, for the use and benefit of the Government, by the officer or person whose duty it shall be to approve the payment of the moneys due under such contract, whether violations of the provisions of such contract [is] are by the contractor or any subcontractor. Any contractor or subcontractor aggrieved by the withholding of any penalty as hereinbefore provided shall have the right, within six months thereafter, to appeal to the head of the department making the contract on behalf of the United States, who shall have power to review the action imposing the penalty, and in all such appeals from such final order whereby a contractor or subcontractor may be aggrieved by the imposition of the penalty hereinbefore provided such contractor or subcontractor may, within six months after decision by such head of a department, file a claim in the Court of Claims, which shall have jurisdiction to hear and decide the matter in like manner as in other cases before said court: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall apply to or be construed to apply to—

(a) Persons employed in connection with dredging or rock excavation in any river or harbor or navigable water of the United States while not directly operating dredging or rock excavation machinery or tools;

(b) Persons engaged in construction or repair of levees or revetments necessary for protection against floods or overflows on the navigable rivers of the United States;

(c) Persons employed in connection with subaqueous construction in any tidal waters;

(d) Contracts for transportation by air, land, or water, for public utility services, for the transmission of intelligence, or for the purchase, renovation, or repair of materials or supplies such as are ordinarily procurable in the open market, except armor and armor plate, whether made to conform to particular specifications or not;

(e) Contracts for farm or reforestation seasonal work;

(f) Contracts to be performed in foreign countries;

(g) Contracts for public works at places without labor supply and so remote or difficult of access that the workmen employed on the contract must live away from their homes;

(h) Violations due to any extraordinary events or conditions of manufacture, or to any emergency caused by fire, famine, flood, or danger to life or property; or by other extraordinary event or condition on account of which the President shall subsequently declare the violation to have been excusable: *Provided further*, That in the case of national emergency the President is authorized to suspend the provisions of this section, in which case the wages of persons employed upon any contract with the United States shall be computed upon a basic daily rate of eight hours' work, with overtime rates to be paid for at no less than time and one-half for all hours' work in excess of eight hours: *And provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or modify the act entitled "An act relating to the limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States and of the District of Columbia," approved August 1, 1892, as modified by the act of March 3, 1913.

Sec. 15. Transfer: No contract with the United States nor any interest therein shall be transferred by the contractor to any other person. In case of such transfer the United States may void the contract and recover from the contractor damages for the breach thereof.

Sec. 16. Domestic material and services: In the making of contracts preference shall be given to articles of domestic production or manufacture, quality, and prices, including in the price of foreign articles the duty prescribed by the tariff act for importation into the United States, being equal. In the transportation by sea of Government personnel, materials, or supplies vessels documented under the laws of the United States or belonging to the United States shall be used, unless the head of the department concerned shall find that the rates charged by said vessels are excessive and unreasonable.

Sec. 16. Domestic materials: In the making of contracts to be performed in the United States, its Territories and possessions, preference shall be given to articles or materials of domestic production, conditions of quality and price, including duty, being equal. The term "articles or materials of domestic production" means articles or materials manufactured or assembled in the United States, its Territories or possessions.

Sec. 17. The President is authorized to prescribe and standardize, so far as practicable, the forms, general provisions, and security to be required for all Government contracts.

Sec. 18. Settlement and suits: No suit shall be entertained by any court against the United States on any claim arising under or out of any contract with the United States, unless the claim shall have been presented [at least 90 days prior thereto] to the General Accounting Office for audit and settlement [and unless the suit shall have been instituted within three years from the date the cause of action accrued: *Provided*, That all claims which shall have accrued at the time this act goes into effect shall be governed by the provisions of section 156 of the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. L. 1139).] and shall have either been settled or remain unsettled for a period of 90 days.

Sec. 19. Repeal provision: (a) The following sections of the Revised Statutes are hereby repealed: 230, 512, 513, 514, 515, 1136, as amended by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 721), and the act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. L. 58); 3709, 3710, 3711, as amended by the act of March 15, 1898, section 6 (30 Stat. L. 316); 3712; [twentieth footnote]; 3713, 3715, 3716, 3717, 3718, as amended by act of June 30, 1890 (26 Stat. L. 197), and by the act of July 19, 1892 (27 Stat. L. 243), and by the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. L. 724); 3719, as amended by the act of May 25, 1896 (29 Stat. L. 136); 3720, as amended by the act of June 22, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 591); 3721, 3722, 3723, 3724, 3725, 3727, 3728, 3729, 3730, 3731, 3732, 3733, 3735, 3736, 3737, 3741, as amended by act of February 27, 1877 (19 Stat. L. 249); [3743, as amended by the act of July 31, 1894, section 18 (28 Stat. L. 210)]; 3744, as amended by act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. L. 198); 3745, 3746, 3747, 3828.

(b) The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed: Act of April 10, 1878 (20 Stat. L. 36), as amended by act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. L. 487); Joint Resolution No. 30, of June 14, 1878 (20 Stat. L. 253); act of January 21, 1881 (21 Stat. L. 317); Joint Resolution No. 24, of May 5, 1894 (28 Stat. L. 582); act of July 16, 1894, section 2 (28 Stat. L. 106); act of August 13, 1894 (28 Stat. L. 278), as amended by act of February 24, 1905 (33 Stat. L. 811), act of June 6, 1902, section 21 (32 Stat. L. 326), act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. L. 518), act of December 11, 1906 (34 Stat. L. 841), act of May 30, 1908, section 34 (35 Stat. L. 545), act of June 17, 1910, section 8 (36 Stat. L. 538), act of June 25, 1910, section 5 (36 Stat. L. 676), act of June 25, 1910, section 23 (36 Stat. L. 861), act of August 22, 1911 (37 Stat. L. 32), act of June 19, 1912 (37 Stat. L. 137), act of March 4, 1915, section 5 (38 Stat. L. 1049); section 3 of the act approved August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. L. 199-200), as amended by the act of June 21, 1906 (34 Stat. L. 328); section 9 of the act approved March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. L. 450), as amended by section 1 of the act approved May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 129); so much of the act of June 26, 1912 (37 Stat. L. 168), and of the act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 668), as requires penal bonds with formal written contracts for the purchase of supplies and materials for the District of Columbia.

(c) All other acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as repealing or modifying—

(1) Statutes relating to the collection, carrying, or distribution of the mails; or

(2) Statutes relating to the purchase, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, of supplies and material for public printing and binding and for paper and envelopes; or

(3) The act of June 17, 1910, creating the General Supply Committee; or

(4) The act of July 2, 1926, entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 780); or

(5) The act of May 7, 1926, entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for the use of the Government of the United States of America" (44 Stat. L. 403).

Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to contracts of the United States Shipping Board, or the United States Shipping Board [Emergency] Merchant Fleet Corporation, relating to the operation of vessels, nor to contracts of the Inland Waterways Corporation.

[Sec. 23. This act shall take effect July 1, 1928.]

Sec. 20. This act shall take effect July 1, 1929, but any contract entered into or any rights or remedies that have accrued prior to that date shall be settled, adjusted, determined, and enforced without regard to this act.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

DECEMBER 17, 1928.

Subject: Amendments to H. R. 5767, a bill to establish uniform requirements affecting Government contracts, and for other purposes.

At the hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in March, 1928, upon H. R. 5767, several amendments to this bill were recommended.

The interdepartmental board of contracts and adjustments has given careful consideration to these proposed amendments and certain other

suggested amendments and has drafted the attached proposed bill, which includes the amendments to H. R. 5767, approved by the board.

These amendments to H. R. 5767 and the reasons therefor are as follows:

Section 1 has been amended by changing the year "1928" to "1929."

In section 2, at the end of paragraph (b), the following words have been added: "and shall include the District of Columbia." The Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommended that this paragraph (b) be clarified to specifically include the District of Columbia, which is not an agency of the Federal Government.

In section 2, paragraph (c), the words "in one instrument" have been added in line 6, page 2. This amendment was deemed advisable in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the United States v. Swift & Co. (270 U. S. 124).

In section 2 paragraph (h) was omitted as unnecessary.

In section 3 paragraph (d) was amended by changing the language preceding the proviso so as to read as follows:

"(d) Leases of real estate by departments for terms not exceeding 3 years, by the State Department for premises in foreign lands for terms not exceeding 10 years, and by the Post Office Department for such periods of time as may now be authorized by law: *Provided*, That no contract shall be made for the leasing of any building or part of building in the District of Columbia unless the same shall have been authorized by law or until an appropriation therefor shall have been made in terms by Congress."

This amendment meets the objection of the Post Office Department, as set forth in letter to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee dated February 28, 1928 (p. 108), of part 2 of the printed hearing, in so far as the restriction of leases to 10 years by that department is concerned. The proviso of paragraph (d) continues existing law which it was believed applies to the Post Office Department and therefore the other recommendation by the Post Office Department that this proviso be amended so as to except the leasing of buildings for postal purposes was not approved. This amendment also limits the State Department to 10 years for leasing premises in foreign lands, which is the limitation now contained in current appropriation acts for this department.

Section 5 was amended by changing paragraph (k) to read as follows:

"(k) For experimental or development work for the military or naval services, or for manufacture or purchase of military or naval matériel for experimentation or test to determine the suitability thereof for actual service."

This amendment was adopted to clarify the language.

In section 5 an additional paragraph (2) was added at the end of the section, reading as follows:

"(2) The advertisement or specifications shall clearly describe the needs of the Government in such terms as to permit full and free competition on such needs."

This foregoing amendment was adopted in connection with the revision of section 7, as hereinafter set forth, to meet objections of the Comptroller General as set forth in his letter of February 4, 1928, to the Judiciary Committee (pp. 97 and 98 of the hearing).

In section 6 the word "concerned" has been inserted after the word "department" in line 9 for the purpose of clarity.

Section 7 has been redrafted to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Award of contracts: All bids shall be publicly opened at the time and place stated in the advertisement. Award shall be made with reasonable promptness by written notice to that responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the specifications, will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered: *Provided*, That acceptance of any other than the lowest bid conforming to the specifications, or the rejection of any bid on the ground of the bidder's irresponsibility, shall be by the head of the department concerned, whose decision shall be final; and in each such case he shall file with the original contract a statement of his reasons therefor, an abstract of all bids received, and a copy of the advertisement: *Provided further*, That all bids may be rejected when it is in the public interest so to do."

This amendment of section 7 requires the head of the department, in case he accepts other than the lowest or rejects any bid on the ground of the bidder's irresponsibility, to file with the original contract a statement of his reasons therefor, an abstract of all bids, and a copy of the advertisement. It is believed that this amendment meets the objection of the Comptroller General to the original draft of section 7 (p. 98 of the hearing), which left the decision "to the interested administrative head without disclosing in connection with the expenditure of public funds any justifying fact or reason."

Section 9 was amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Liquidated damages: Whenever, in contracts to which the United States is a party, there is a provision for liquidated damages for delay, the head of the department concerned, stating his reasons in writing therefor, may remit the whole or any part of such damages as in his opinion may be just and equitable."

The foregoing amendment was the language of section 9 as originally drafted by the board which has reaffirmed its views that the authority to remit liquidated damages for delay should be vested in the head of

the department concerned as set forth by Mr. Wetmore on pages 9 to 28 of the hearing.

Section 10 was amended by changing the word "an," in line 1 and also in line 3, to the word "the." This amendment meets in part the objection of the Comptroller General as set forth on page 96 of the hearing.

Section 12 was amended by adding "heat and light" in addition to "rent" that may be paid for in advance in foreign countries as recommended by the State Department. (P. 99 of hearing.)

Section 13 has been amended by giving the United States six months instead of three months after final settlement in which to bring suit and by giving other claimants 18 months after such settlement instead of 1 year in which to bring suit.

This section was also amended by providing that the final settlement means settlement by the General Accounting Office, where all contracts under existing law are now finally settled, rather than a settlement by the department as now construed by the courts. (See p. 15 of hearing.) The section has also been amended by allowing 90 calendar days instead of 1 month after the date of the last publication in which the United States or other claimant may intervene in the suit. The word "contract," in line 1, page 9, was changed to the word "work" and the word "district," in line 6, page 9, was changed to the word "appropriate."

There was also added, after the word "settlement," in line 9, page 9, the following language:

"Any claimant under such bond shall, upon application therefor and furnishing an affidavit to the General Accounting Office that he has supplied labor or materials for such work and payment has not been made therefor, be furnished, without cost, with a certified copy of said contract and bond, upon which he may bring said suit, and he shall also be furnished by the said office with a statement of the date that final settlement has been made under the contract, which statement of the date of settlement shall be conclusive upon the parties."

The foregoing additional language was decided upon after conference by the contract board with Mr. A. Preston Shealey, who testified before the Judiciary Committee and recommended amendments to this section. (See pp. 28-32 of hearing.)

In paragraph (d), section 13, the words "as provided by law" at the end of this paragraph were omitted.

In section 14, line 13, page 11, the word "is" was changed to "are" for grammatical reasons.

In paragraph (d) of section 14 the words "renovation or repair" were inserted after the word "purchase" in line 14, page 12.

Section 16 was amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. Domestic materials: In the making of contracts to be performed in the United States, its Territories, and possessions preference shall be given to articles or materials of domestic production, conditions of quality and price, including duty, being equal. The term 'articles or materials of domestic production' means articles or materials manufactured or assembled in the United States, its Territories, or possessions."

The foregoing language was recommended by the State Department. The last sentence of section 16 relating to transportation on United States vessels was omitted because of section 601 of the merchant marine act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 697), requiring officers or employees of the United States to travel on ships registered under the laws of the United States when such ships are available.

Section 18 has been amended by omitting the provision that would reduce the statute of limitations from six to three years on contracts. It was not deemed advisable to amend the Judicial Code in this bill in respect to the statute of limitations relating to contracts leaving the statute of limitation six years as to other claims. The other amendment to this section 18 was for the purpose of permitting a claimant to bring suit if the General Accounting Office has not settled his claim within 90 days.

In section 19 the words "twentieth footnote" are omitted in line 4, page 15, and the specific repeal of 3743 of the Revised Statutes as amended (lines 16 and 17, p. 15) has been omitted from the specific repeal provision as recommended by the Comptroller General. (P. 97 of hearing.)

There has been added for specific repeal at the end of paragraph (b), section 19, the acts relating to the Indian Service as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior. (P. 100 of hearing.)

There has also been added for specific repeal under paragraph (b), section 19, so much of the act of June 26, 1912, and of the act of September 1, 1916, as requires penal bonds with formal written contracts for the purchase of supplies and materials for the District of Columbia. This repeal is concurred in by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

A new paragraph 5 has been added under paragraph (d) of section 19, exempting the act of May 7, 1926, from repeal as recommended by the State Department. (P. 99 of hearing.)

The words "United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation" have been corrected to read "United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation," in line 16, page 17.

Section 23 of the bill has been changed to section 20, to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. This act shall take effect July 1, 1929, but any contract entered into or any rights or remedies that have accrued prior to that date shall be settled, adjusted, determined, and enforced without regard to this act."

MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 272

Resolved, That Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives be amended by inserting a new paragraph following paragraph 40, which shall be known as 40a and shall read as follows:

"40a. On memorials, to consist of three members."

That Rule XI be amended by inserting a new paragraph following paragraph 40, that shall be numbered 40a and shall read as follows:

"40a. It shall be the duty of the Committee on Memorials to arrange a suitable program for each memorial day observed by the House of Representatives as a memorial day in memory of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who have died during the preceding year, and to arrange for the publication of the proceedings thereof."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, if this resolution is adopted a new standing committee of the House will be created, known as the Committee on Memorials, to consist of three members. For a long time it has been the feeling among the Members that our usual memorial day program was falling short of what was intended and that it lacked a great deal of the dignity of a proper memorial day in the House of Representatives. If, perchance, some of the relatives of deceased Members should happen to come here on that day, it is always a great disappointment to see so very few Members present and apparently going through a perfunctory performance. This resolution provides for the creation of a committee that will formulate some kind of a program, and is very general in every way. Such a committee may suggest that we have a memorial day during the week in place of a regular session of the House, and at that time have some Member deliver a eulogy in memory of deceased Members. In addition to that, if any Member from the specific State desires to make some remarks with reference to a deceased Member, of course he would be allowed to do so.

There is no definite program formed at the present time, but it is expected that this committee will do something along this line and will arrange for a program that is much more satisfactory than the manner in which these memorial services have been observed during the past.

Some one has asked me how this committee would report. I have not given that question very careful consideration, but it would seem to me that the chairman of the committee could rise and present a resolution, the same as a Member does from any State that has a deceased Member, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, and that resolution probably would simply set aside some specific day to be observed with a memorial program.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As the gentleman will remember, I was not present at the meeting of the Committee on Rules at which this resolution was considered, so I want to ask one or two questions for information. I note that the last paragraph provides that—

a. It shall be the duty of the Committee on Memorials to arrange a suitable program for each memorial day observed by the House of Representatives as a memorial day in memory of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who have died during the preceding year, and to arrange for the publication of the proceedings thereof.

I am not quite sure that I understand. For instance, if this committee were in existence now, it would be its duty to arrange a memorial day for—

Mr. SNELL (interposing). For all of the Members of the House and Senate who have died during the last recess and up to the present time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is the language sufficiently clear also to carry out this idea? Suppose there is a death after the regular memorial day and during the session.

Mr. SNELL. During our discussion the idea was to have simply one day and have that at the very latter part of each session, and only have one each session. If some Member should happen to die after that, I think under this program the matter would go over until the next session.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. For instance, if a Member should die during the closing days of a session such as this, whatever memorial exercises were held by the Congress would have to be held at this session because the Congress dies on the 4th of March.

Mr. SNELL. That is true.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It could not go over until the next Congress?

Mr. SNELL. That is right. An occasion might arise once in a while where this would not cover the situation, but my own idea would be to set aside a day somewhere between the 25th and the 28th of February, or somewhere in that vicinity, as a memorial day for this session. There might be some contingencies that may arise where this would not cover the matter, but I know of nothing that absolutely prohibits the memorial exercises being held in a following Congress.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suppose, of course, in its practical working, it will have to be tried out.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; and we may have to change it after some experience; we simply want to improve the present situation and hope to make it better.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I would like to ask one further question. I notice the resolution provides that this committee shall consist of three members. This thought occurs to me—and if it has been gone over in committee I do not want to interfere with the plans of the committee—but just as a matter of first impression with me, it seems that the committee ought to consist of at least five members, because it is a standing committee of the House—

Mr. SNELL. Yes; it is to be a standing committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If one of the three members should be ill, there would be no one to take his place. It would not be like a special committee. You might be able to appoint some one to take his place or something of that sort. However, I do not know that it is of any very great importance.

Mr. SNELL. There is practically nothing controversial coming before this committee. Its duty is simply to sit down and work out some kind of program, and if there are only two present they could probably take care of all the business that would come to the committee. It was not the intention that this committee should have any room or cause any expense whatever, but simply that some one be recognized or appointed by the House to take charge of these memorial exercises.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suppose we might as well try it out with the three Members.

Mr. SNELL. And then if we find out we need to make some changes along any line, we can amend the resolution.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. How does the gentleman interpret the language in the proposed resolution "during the preceding year"? Would not that mean by common construction "during the preceding calendar year"? That I suppose, however, is not the intention.

Mr. SNELL. The idea of the committee and the construction that we placed on that was that each session of Congress would hold memorial exercises in memory of the Members who had died since the last session.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Who had died theretofore.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; and hold it during the latter part of the session.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The word "theretofore" would express exactly what the gentleman means, whereas the language "during the preceding year" might fairly be construed as referring to the preceding calendar year.

Mr. SNELL. Well, there are a lot of things that if you try to construe too strictly will get you into trouble. I think we have got to let this matter work itself out, and if we find that it is wrong in any way we can change it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Possibly this might tie in with what the gentleman from Virginia has suggested. The term "previous year" may be a little hard and fast as we come to have experience under this plan. It seems to me probably we might give a little more leeway to the committee—

Mr. SNELL. That is exactly what we had in mind, to give a great deal of leeway to the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. I was going to suggest this: It may be that experience will show it is undesirable to take a day at the close of the session or it may be desired to have each session covered by itself or each Congress or each year, and I was going to suggest that instead of saying "the previous year," as I understand the rule does—

Mr. SNELL. "During the preceding year" is the exact wording.

Mr. CRAMTON (continuing). That you say "during the preceding period," and then let "period" be construed according to our experience. We may find that the period will be a year or it may be a session or it may be a Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I think the gentleman is right about that; that would be equivalent to saying "theretofore." I think that would express the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. CRAMTON. Change the one word "year" to "period."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman is proposing to put the resolution on its passage?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is it contemplated that there should be any debate on it?

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman wants time I will gladly yield him time.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. There has been no arrangement in regard to it?

Mr. SNELL. No; I did not know that there would be any opposition to it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. This has been brought to the House without any previous notice, and I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. What would be the effect of this on existing orders?

Mr. SNELL. I do not think it would affect an existing order. I know that this is indefinite and the whole proposition is indefinite, but after a while we can see how it works and if it is necessary to change it we can do so. As to changing the preceding "year" to preceding "period" I have no objection if it is thought best to do so.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. May I have about five minutes?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, for some years I have been very much interested in the subject matter proposed in the pending resolution. I believe that to most Members of the Congress, the present plan of holding memorial services in memory of deceased Members of the Senate and House of Representatives is a source of genuine humiliation.

The Senate and House combined have a total membership of 531, not including the Delegates and Commissioners from the Territories. From among so large a number of people it is but natural that during every year there would be quite a number of deaths.

Turning back to just a few Congresses, I find the records of deaths as follows:

Sixty-seventh: 4 Senators, 19 Representatives.

Sixty-eighth: 7 Senators, 17 Representatives.

Sixty-ninth: 7 Senators, 9 Representatives.

It usually happens under our present procedure that during each of the last several Sundays of each session, memorial services are held in this House Chamber for each individual Member who has departed, these services being held as you know, not as one service but as distinct services, one after the other, having nothing in common, excepting the calling of the House to order, the prayer by the Chaplain, and the motion to adjourn. With so many services being held, naturally the attendance must be light, and the attendance is usually less than 20 Members and sometimes I have seen the membership shrink to 5 or 6.

I recall that upon one Sunday, eight separate memorial services were held, the first one commencing at 12 o'clock, and the last one concluding at between 7 and 8 o'clock at night.

The proposed plan, as I understand it, would call for one memorial service annually, that naturally would be held toward the close of the session. I could hope that it would be held during a week day and not upon Sunday. The plan, as I understand it, would contemplate a reverential, respectful memorial service. There would be music, there would be prayer by the Chaplain, there would be the reading of the names of the deceased, there would possibly be two fairly short addresses, more music, and adjournment. Around the rostrum it would be appropriate to have flowers. The whole program, it would seem, could be concluded in from one hour to an hour and fifteen minutes. Admission to the galleries could be by card, and invitations to the friends and relatives of the deceased Members should be issued by the House.

The present plan is no longer suited to our condition. It is the outgrowth of the normal and natural plan that was reasonable at the beginning of the history of our Congress.

During the first Congress there was but one death of a Member of the House. No death occurred on the Senate side. During the first 40 or 50 years of our congressional history burials occurred for the most part at the Capital City; funerals were held in the House Chamber. The memorial service and the funeral service were one.

Then, with the building of railroads, the bodies of the deceased Members came to be taken to their homes for burial. This procedure suggested the incongruity of two funeral services, and shortly thereafter the Congress abandoned the practice of pronouncing eulogies at the time of the death of a Member and adopted the policy of holding memorial services weeks or months later at some suitable time.

Prior to 1884 it was the custom of Members of the House, when a Member died, to wear crêpe upon their arms for a period of 30 days out of respect to the deceased. If that practice were followed to-day, and the deaths of Members of the Senate and House were to occur at regular intervals, there might be Congresses, as there have been in the past, during all of which time the Members, by the wearing of crêpe, would constantly proclaim their sorrow because of the loss of a colleague.

With the changing conditions that have come about since the early days of the Republic and the comparatively small size of the congressional bodies in contrast with the large membership of to-day, I believe we have come to the time when we ought to adopt a memorial procedure that would befit the dignity of the House. It seems to me that under the terms of the proposed resolution such a procedure can be worked out.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. About how often would we have these memorial services?

Mr. FRENCH. Once at the close of every session of Congress.

Another question relates to the printing of the memorial service. I would have the memorial services that occur printed just as is done now. Then in addition to the general service I would have the Members granted the privilege of extending their remarks under arrangements with the committee touching the individuals whom they might desire to honor in that way. There could then be printed as many volumes as there had been deaths. Each volume could contain the record of the service, and in addition, the tributes to one of the deceased. Thus, the memorial volume for A would contain the general service and also the estimates of fellow Members touching A, and for B it would contain the same general service and in addition the estimates of individual Members touching B, and the same with C.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have been wondering whether the final language there "To arrange for the publication of proceedings" might in any way be in conflict with the present law. The Joint Committee on Printing, of course, now, under the law, as I understand it and independent of any rules of the House, has the jurisdiction of this particular type of printing.

Mr. FRENCH. My thought would be, although I do not know how the language would be construed, that the function of this committee would have to do with the arrangement and subject matter of programs, and extension of remarks rather than with the detail of the printing. I would not seek to take that power away from the committee that has charge of it now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The point is that there is certain printing that is controlled by law and not by the rules of either the House or the Senate, and that printing which is controlled by law, of course, is under the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Printing. If there is any possibility of conflict, it should be carefully considered.

Mr. SNELL. I do not think that could be construed to be in conflict with the present law governing the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. FRENCH. I think not.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] has called attention to the diminishing respect which Congress is showing to its deceased Members. A cynical comment would be that it marks the diminishing respect which Members of Congress have for themselves.

I do not share the gentleman's view as to what will come out of the adoption of this resolution. I think it is merely

another step in the progress of that diminishing respect and that it will continue to grow less until the time when we will pay no attention to the decease of Members whatever.

Under our present practice we set apart a day, usually Sunday, on which the friends of the deceased Member and his family may gather here and show respect to his memory. It is true that those exercises are not largely attended. Nevertheless, I have observed some of them which were very beautiful and impressive. I have listened to some splendid addresses and I have seen some fine marks of feeling displayed here upon the floor on those occasions. I have seen evidences that the Member who had departed did yet live in the memory of his colleagues and of his friends.

It has been our practice to print the proceedings of those occasions in a separate volume—a memorial volume, with a handsome steel engraving of the deceased Member—and to make those volumes available to Members of the House and to the family of the deceased. In that way his memory has been perpetuated in an appropriate and dignified way.

It is now proposed to consolidate all of the memorial exercises into one, so to have only a single occasion during a term when all Members who have died during the term will be remembered. Thereby, of course, the importance of the occasion as respecting each of the deceased Members will be minimized. Instead of Members feeling it a duty and a privilege to come and pay tribute to the memory of their departed associates, they will come, if at all, in a perfunctory manner, as they do to the sessions of the House, and we will soon find that the consolidated and general memorial exercise will be no better attended than are the individual and separate memorial exercises as now held. In short, when the novelty has gone it will transpire that only those will attend the exercises who have been designated to speak, and no longer will the friends who really loved the deceased feel moved to speak in behalf of his memory and to pay tribute to his quality. The occasion will become a perfunctory and merely formal thing. Thus will the occasion continue to diminish and diminish, until finally it will disappear altogether.

The report of the consolidated memorial exercise will be printed in a single volume, and that volume will not be made available to the same extent as at present. It will not be furnished to the same extent to the family of the deceased. In that way something will be saved in the way of printing, but much in the way of respect which we might show the departed will be lost. I think it will be a very high price to pay in the dignity and honor of the House of Representatives, and that we should not now adopt this custom of lumping the deceased Members all together and reducing the importance of each in that way.

I do not like to depart from our ancient custom. We have had it for a long time. Why quit it now? Why jump to a new and ill-considered system? Why should this be done? Why depart from a system which works well? I ask the gentleman from New York this question.

The time will come in development under the proposed practice when we will cease to issue the memorial volumes. They will be no longer printed, and the families of deceased Members will be deprived of the solace to be found in them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield me two additional minutes?

Mr. SNELL. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The time will come when the proceedings in the memorial sessions will merely be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will consist largely of "leaves to print." Members will be found staying at home or in their offices and absenting themselves from what has become a tiresome and meaningless ceremony, and it will finally transpire that our ancient and appropriate custom of holding memorial exercises will be wholly abandoned.

The question comes up now, as it seems to me, Is it proper to do this? Is it proper to cease paying respect to deceased Members? Is it nothing to be a Member of the House of Representatives? Has it ceased to be of any consequence?

Let us hold to this established custom and our old practice. We have not had, it is true, the presence of the entire membership on these occasions; but at least all have been privileged to come who wanted to come. And I trust that if and when my time shall come only those who want to do so and who love me will attend. And I also trust that I will not be put merely in a category of those who are deceased and be classed in a consolidated assortment of Members who have died—good, bad, and indifferent—and have delivered, for the edification of the few who may be constrained to attend, some perfunctory funeral oration full of wise saws and solemn and impersonal

abjurations such, as with equal propriety, might have been delivered over a dead dog. [Applause.]

For these reasons I am not in favor of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me five minutes?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. One of the main reasons for my opposing it is that it takes the human element out of these memorial exercises. Under the present system, when a Member dies and a day is set apart, usually a Sunday, to hold exercises in honor of his memory, his family invites a few of his friends among the Members of the House who knew him in his lifetime to come here to speak on that occasion. If this resolution is adopted, you take that prerogative away from the family of the deceased Member and turn it over to a committee of one. They say a committee of three; but you know the chairman of that committee will run it, and he may be a man who possibly did not know the deceased when he saw him on the floor of the House; a man who does not know his family. And he selects some one to deliver a memorial oration on that occasion.

Mr. SNELL. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi what rights are we taking from the family?

Mr. RANKIN. You are taking away from the family the prerogative of selecting and inviting friends of the deceased to come here on these memorial occasions to speak on the life and character of a former fellow Member. You are turning this over to a committee of not over three, and, as I said, it will really consist of one member, because the chairman will practically run it; and he will select somebody to arrange for the memorial to a man whom he possibly did not know when he saw him on the floor of the House. I say you are taking out of these memorial exercises the human element, and I hope the House will vote this resolution down. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York permit a question for information?

Mr. SNELL. Gladly.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Under this resolution the committee in charge will select those who will speak on the occasion of the omnibus funeral memorial. On that I would like to speak of my own particular attitude. I speak on this floor only when I get opportunity to speak from my fellow Members. On an occasion of that kind suppose the name of some Member of the House who had been very dear to him should appear in the list of the dead, and I should want to speak a tribute to his memory. I could not under the rule.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, let me say that the gentleman is entirely mistaken as to that. There is no hard and fast rule that fixes it in any way. This is an experiment, to try it out and see if we can not get a more dignified method of conducting these memorial exercises.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Do I understand the gentleman to say that on an occasion of that kind it would be perfectly proper for me to rise and speak without asking for time?

Mr. SNELL. I think probably you might have to suggest that you wanted to speak. Of course, it would not be an open field day, but without question the committee would yield time to anybody who wanted to speak.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Then I would be debarred from speaking, because I do not ask for time from an individual or from a committee. I ask for time only from all my fellow Members and by their unanimous consent.

Mr. SNELL. Somebody would be in charge of the committee. The gentleman would have to get permission to speak. I expect the gentleman would come under the same rules of the House as any one else.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. The gentleman from Nebraska is loyal to the rules, but he never takes advantage of them; and he never asks a committee or a man for time in which to speak.

Mr. SNELL. I do not understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. It is very clear and simple. The gentleman knows that this particular gentleman from Nebraska never asks for time unless he asks the whole House for time.

Mr. SNELL. What would be the situation if every other man in the House wanted to act as an independent unit? We would never get anywhere.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. It would be a delightful situation. I hope to see the time when our Speaker will control all the time, and no individual Member will control the time of fellow Members.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman has entirely misinterpreted the intention of the committee and the views of the com-

mittee which has presented this resolution. The idea of the committee is that we shall have more dignified and humane and proper memorial services for deceased Members of the House and Senate than we have had under the former arrangement. Nearly everyone thinks that the other plan has been a failure. We should try out this new plan, and if it does not work, then there is no reason why it should not be changed again and go back to the old system or try some other plan. But I know that the feeling on the part of the Members of the House is that the former memorial services have not been satisfactory, and it is to give them a little more humane and dignified touch, calculated to make them more satisfactory, that we are presenting this resolution at this time.

I can assure the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Nebraska that we are not going to take anything away from the family.

They will be consulted and taken into consideration just as they ever have been, and I am sure under the guidance of this committee those relatives who come here to attend the services will find the exercises much more satisfactory than they have been under the form used in the past.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand under this proposed resolution the addresses of all those who have spoken concerning those who have died will be published together in one volume?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The relatives of a gentleman from Massachusetts or a gentleman from California, let us say, if they get one of these memorial volumes, get with it the memorials relating to a gentleman from Colorado or a gentleman from Mississippi or some other State in the same volume. In other words, instead of the separate small volumes concerning each Member, it will be a volume of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing memorial addresses on all Members who have died within the year?

Mr. FRENCH. The resolution itself does not provide a hard and fast procedure. My thought is that there would be as many volumes as there would be Members who had died, just as at this time the frontispiece of each volume contains the program that has occurred on the floor, where each of several volumes even now contains the same prayer offered by the Chaplain. The other part would contain the eulogies or comments upon the life, character, and public services of each deceased Member by Members of the House. Much of present volumes, after all, is by way of extension of remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose the State of Idaho had been so unfortunate as to lose a Member. Now, in order to get a record of what is said about the deceased Member by his friends on this floor, why compel the relatives to take a record of all the speeches with reference to all the other Members who have died within that year?

Mr. FRENCH. But the gentleman did not understand me. I suggested a separate volume, a small, compact volume, for each Member, containing just the part pertaining to that Member, in addition to the general program.

Mr. SNELL. As the gentleman from Idaho has suggested, there is no hard and fast rule laid down in this resolution. The procedure is to be worked out in such a way as to provide for a more satisfactory condition than we have at the present time. The committee can provide for as many volumes and for as many different kinds as it may see fit.

Mr. RANKIN. Then the gentleman from New York agrees with the gentleman from the State of Idaho?

Mr. SNELL. I am perfectly willing to have it worked out along that line.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Possibly the gentleman has already covered it, but I just came on the floor. As I understand, the intention is to have just one eulogy by some Member to cover all—is that the idea?

Mr. SNELL. Have that as the principal eulogy and then in addition to that have some Member from the State of the deceased make any eulogy he desired or as many as desired.

Mr. WINGO. Of course, the gentleman understands it would be highly necessary that Members from the specific State say something about the particular individual. With the practice as it has been, if one Member from the State should speak it would be necessary for the others from the State to speak, otherwise there would be some criticism, and yet if all were to do that with reference to the men who have died in the course of the year you would have something like 170 speeches on that one day.

Mr. SNELL. Well, this is my idea: The State of New York has 43 Members, and if a Member from the State of New York should die, the New York delegation could select a spokesman from among its Members to speak in behalf of the delegation.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand, this resolution refers the whole matter to a committee on memorials.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I have said several times. There is nothing definite or fixed about it. All we are trying to do is to have something worked out which would be better than that we have at the present time.

Mr. WINGO. I appreciate the difficulties we have now, and there ought to be some improvement.

Mr. SNELL. That is what we are trying to do. In this resolution no restriction is placed on this committee, and if we find it does not work out there is no reason why it should not be changed.

Mr. WINGO. It could not report any worse plan than we have now, and it is to be hoped we may get something better.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. The part of the resolution to which I object is that which places in this committee the discretion to publish separate volumes or one volume. As it is now eulogies for each Member are printed in a separate volume, and a considerable number are allotted to each Member from the State interested, probably 150. Those copies get into the hands of the friends and relatives of the deceased Member, who appreciate them, whereas if you placed it in the discretion of the committee and put it all in one volume probably one Member from that State would get a dozen or 15 copies to go into the district where the man lived and from which he served his country.

Mr. SNELL. I do not think there will be any curtailment in the number. I think they can get all they want.

Mr. ALMON. The gentleman says it is an experiment, but as it is such a serious thing I do not think we ought to experiment with it until we give it more consideration.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. It seems to be the principal objection to this resolution that the memorial speeches are all to be printed in one volume. The practice to-day is to include the memorial addresses concerning each Member in a separate volume. It seems to me this is about the only redeeming feature of our present plan. If this practice might be continued and at the same time do away with separate memorial service days, it would be a great improvement, because, I am sorry to say, that the present memorial service days are very poorly attended and are not as impressive as they should be.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. How can you continue the present volume when you discontinue the speeches that make up the volume?

Mr. TILSON. I do not believe that it is the intention to discontinue all the speeches. Many of the speeches that are printed in the volume are never made on the floor and those that are made on the floor might just as well be put in by leave to print because there is practically no one here to hear them.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Then that knocks the whole thing in the head.

Mr. RANKIN. Will not the same thing apply under the new rule?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, in line 13, I move to strike out the word "year" and insert the word "period."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SNELL: In line 13 of the resolution, strike out the word "year" and insert in lieu thereof the word "period."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 3800) to carry out provisions of the Pan American Postal Convention concerning franking privileges for diplomatic officers in Pan American countries and the United States be substituted for the House bill (H. R. 12415).

This bill passed both Houses unanimously and it has the approval of the Post Office Department and the majority and minority leaders of the House.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the request. Mr. KENDALL. The request is to substitute a Senate bill for a House bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. How does the matter come up for consideration—by unanimous consent?

Mr. KENDALL. I have asked unanimous consent.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask the gentleman what is the parliamentary situation? Has the House passed one bill and the Senate an identical bill?

Mr. KENDALL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. And the gentleman simply wishes to have the Senate bill substituted for the House bill, is that correct?

Mr. KENDALL. That is correct.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is the bill on the House Calendar?

Mr. KENDALL. The request is to have the House bill removed from the House Calendar.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is the Senate bill on the House Calendar?

Mr. KENDALL. The bill was passed.

Mr. TILSON. As I understand, each bill has passed its respective House unanimously and the intention is to get together by one House passing the bill as passed by the other House.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is not the question to pass the Senate bill instead of making a substitution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KENDALL] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3800 and consider the same. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As I noticed the reading of the first part of the bill, it gives unlimited franking privileges to certain diplomatic officers, both on their official and their private mail in the United States, but as to the consuls and the vice consuls they only have the franking privilege on their official mail. What is the idea of giving the franking privilege on the private mail of these diplomatic officers?

Mr. KENDALL. It is an agreement that was arrived at between the different Pan American countries.

Mr. WINGO. I understand it is an agreement and that the bill proposes to carry out that agreement, which will give unlimited franking privileges in the United States for private as well as official mail of all the diplomatic representatives of these countries. Now, why give the diplomatic representatives, some of whom may be of less importance than the consul general of his country, the franking privilege upon his private mail and yet restrict the franking privilege of the consul general of that country to official mail? Should you not restrict all of them to official mail? Why should we ask for the American diplomatic representatives in these foreign countries the right to send their laundry by mail franked or their billets doux, or anything else? Why not confine it to official mail?

Mr. KENDALL. The same privilege, I will say to the gentleman, is accorded to the United States by these countries.

Mr. WINGO. That is why I am objecting. Why do this? Why should we ask other countries to give unlimited franking privileges to the private mail of some man who happens to be a member of the diplomatic corps? I am not talking about the ambassador. I should not object to the privilege being given to the ambassador or the chief representative of a great nation, but the idea of saying that these little "tea hounds" that we have attached to our embassies and attached to the other embassies can write their love notes and their social correspondence and their correspondence with their bootleggers, all of which shall be officially franked even though it may be private mail, is going a little too far. We get criticized enough about the expense we are put to for handling our official mail, which is very small compared with the dead-head mail that is carried by the departments of the Government.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I will when I get the information I have asked.

Mr. KENDALL. I will say to the gentleman that this bill was considered by the Post Office Committees of the House and Senate, passed unanimously by both Houses, has the approval of the Post Office Department, and there has been no objection to the bill thus far.

Mr. WINGO. That may be a reason, but it never has occurred to me that the fact that everybody went to sleep in this House and passed something unanimously is conclusive evidence it is meritorious, which is the gentleman's answer. What reason has the gentleman? How can we justify it? If

you are going to give these officers this privilege, will you not have to give it to other officers? Why not give it to Members of Congress? If you are going to give it to a little attaché from Panama and let him send his private mail anywhere in the United States free, Members of Congress will come along and say, "Why not have our private mail sent free?"

Mr. KENDALL. That is the privilege of the Congress.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; it is a privilege, and that is what I am objecting to. Instead of extending these privileges that have no justification and are criticized, why does not the gentleman undertake to curtail some of the privileges and bring about a reform and limit the franking privilege to strictly official matters?

Mr. KENDALL. I think it is practically limited to official matters in this bill.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman's bill does not do that. The gentleman's bill gives unlimited franking privileges to every little forty-second military attaché from Panama or any other Pan American country, and if that is done, you are going to have to grant it to the other nations.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield? The restrictions here are under such regulation as the Postmaster General will prescribe. I do not think it is supposed by the Post Office Committee that the Postmaster General would prescribe regulations under which they could send their private correspondence.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman from Iowa is one of the ablest lawyers in the House, and he knows how, without any exception, such a law has been interpreted. Would he dare to make a regulation that would curtail the privilege? No; it would be a regulation as to how the privilege could be exercised and not limited.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I admit that the language is rather broad, but I do know that when the matter was before the Post Office Committee it was contemplated to pass a law to permit free exchange of official correspondence.

Mr. WINGO. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman spoke about franking mail to bootleggers in the Diplomatic Service. They do not have to frank their mail to the bootleggers; the embassies are the biggest bootleggers we have. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. Well, my ignorance of the actions of bootleggers is confessed, and I am willing to accept the information from the gentleman from Wisconsin. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. If I have the floor.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The gentleman says that under the regulation by the Post Office Department they could give unlimited franking privilege to these officials. Under the provisions of the regulations of the Post Office Department you send your official file to your district in one of these boxes prepared by the Government. You have 150 or 200 Veterans' Bureau cases. When you get home and want to send that file back you have to send it back four pounds at a time. You can not send your own files in the same way that you sent them home. You have to let the Postmaster look through those files to see if you have any old socks or shoes that you want to frank; and here you extend the franking privilege to these people to send trunkfuls of whatever they please.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that the provisions of this bill were not initiated in the House. They simply came to us to carry out the provisions of an agreement entered into between the United States and some of these countries. So that all we have to do is to provide a law which will permit the Postmaster General to carry out the agreement which the Government had entered into with these countries.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have not felt disposed to oppose the bill. I think I was not here when it was considered before, but the statement of the gentleman from New York has made me somewhat dubious as to the attitude that ought to be assumed by the House touching this matter. I do not want to get myself in the attitude of agreeing that it is the duty of Congress in dealing with these internal matters, like the Postal Service, to carry out whatever treaty the executive department—for the Post Office Department is a part of the executive department—may choose to make. I do not think the House ought to encourage the idea that the treaty-making branch of the Government can go out and make a treaty and then have Congress carry it out. The statement of the gentleman from New York renders me doubtful whether we ought to pass the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I did not intend to state that it was our duty to carry it out; I was informing the House what happened. When the bill came before the House the House could

turn it down or approve it. The House having agreed to it, it ought to show on the Record why the House agreed to it.

Mr. WINGO. If the House in a moment of mental aberration passed the bill by unanimous consent, and it passed the Senate both bodies have passed the identical provision in separate bills. When the Senate learns that the House has turned down the Senate bill granting special privileges they will call up the House bill and pass it, and it will become a law. I shall not object to this, but I hope that the committee who has jurisdiction of these matters in the future, instead of extending privileges to those in private life, will curtail the privileges to those in public life.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads considered this bill very carefully, and after full consideration it was unanimously approved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

THE SERVING OF FOOD IN THE CLOAKROOMS

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, the last session of Congress appropriated almost \$400,000 to improve the ventilating system in this Chamber and in the Senate Chamber. Of that amount about \$175,000 was expended in improving the ventilation of this Chamber. It was for the purpose of conserving the health and the happiness of the Members of the House that such action was taken. However, we overlooked one serious condition which has more to do, perhaps, with the good health of Members than the matter of ventilation. Until we passed an order asking the Navy Department to assign a doctor to the House for the benefit of the Members of the House, we had overlooked the fact that we were carrying a source of infection, distribution of illness, sickness, and contagion, through the medium of food served in the little cubbyholes underneath the gallery. This doctor, who is in attendance upon the Members of the House as they may need him, made a thorough investigation of the sanitary conditions, and he reports that these are two of the most insanitary places, if not the most insanitary, of any place in the District of Columbia where food is served, and that if these little restaurants had existed elsewhere in the District undoubtedly the District health authorities would have taken action.

With this information and upon his advice, the sale of food in the cloakrooms has been abandoned. To take the place of that, if any of the Members find themselves obliged to remain on the floor of the House during the lunch period, arrangements have been made at the restaurant downstairs to serve sandwiches inclosed in sanitary envelopes, milk in sanitary cups, and such other food as can be served up here without contamination or fear of contagion.

Mr. ALMON. And with hot soup also?

Mr. UNDERHILL. The gentleman will have to go to the restaurant for hot soup.

Mr. ALMON. The House physician said that they had arranged to serve hot soup down there.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Oh, we will do that down in the restaurant.

Mr. ALMON. I mean at the lunch counter.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If a man has to remain on the floor of the House because of committee assignments or public business, he may have these sandwiches served. This is entirely in the interest of the health of the Members. I think that we have more trouble from lack of care in eating than from any other cause. Many of us who have been here for some time have seen several of our colleagues collapse soon after the lunch hour. There is much valuable advice which the doctor offers with reference to your eating; and, I think, if you will consult with the doctor, all of you will enjoy good health during the next year. It is my hope that the new year will bring to you health, happiness, and contentment, as well as success here. These things you can not obtain unless you eat properly, and the doctor is the right man to see in respect to that.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his good wishes; but will he yield to me for a moment?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Does this doctor say when the contagion or infection takes place on the sandwich—whether it is before it is wrapped with paper or afterwards? I am driving at something which I think has a good deal of common sense in it.

I would like to know whether or not the man who fixes the sandwich downstairs has any cleaner hands than the man who

fixed the sandwich in the cloakroom, and if the tongue or the ham that he fixes downstairs in the restaurant has been inspected differently from what it was in the cloakrooms, or if it had been inspected up here any differently from what it will be inspected downstairs. Where the germ lodges himself is on the sandwich before it goes into the paper, and I would like to have the gentleman from Massachusetts inform us whether the conditions are better downstairs and whether when we get the sandwich wrapped up we will be any more secure when we unwrap it up here than if we were to get it up here in the manner in which we have been getting it?

Mr. UNDERHILL. That is a question which I suppose scientists might ponder over just as they have over the question of whether the chicken or the egg came first. As a matter of fact, the doctor is going to make a thorough inspection—and has already made a partial one—of everything connected with the restaurant downstairs. We propose to follow his advice and cooperate with him to the fullest extent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered printed without appendices:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 12 of the act of Congress of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the twenty-eighth annual report of the Governor of Porto Rico, including the reports of the heads of the several departments of the government of Porto Rico and that of the auditor, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1928.

I recommend that the report of the Governor of Porto Rico, without appendices, be printed as a congressional document.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 3, 1929.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15712, making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be not fixed at this time, but that it be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLLINS, and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the War Department appropriation bill, and asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate to-day be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Mississippi. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object for the purpose of making a statement. I do not want to let go unchallenged in the RECORD, to be broadcast to the country, the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL], that in the cloakrooms of the House of Representatives we have been maintaining lunch counters that are the most insanitary of any eating place in the District of Columbia. I have great respect for all doctors, but I have never seen cleaner food or a cleaner place than the small lunch tables that have been for years in the two cloakrooms, in fact, ever since I have been a Member of this House. I have never heard of anybody getting sick through eating the food that has been served in the cloakrooms. I, myself, have gotten sick through eating food served in the restaurant. However, we all know that the country is a little bit inclined to be glad to get anything that it can on which to hang a criticism of Congress, and to-morrow morning it will go out to the country that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] had his New England sanitary soul outraged because under his nose this doctor found out that we had insanitary conditions in the cloakrooms. I wish that the food which is served in all of the hotels, cafés, and restaurants in the District of Columbia were as clean as this food that we have been getting in the cloakrooms. [Applause.] I go further and say deliberately that I wish the food served in the restaurant downstairs could come to us with the same assurance that it is sanitary as did the food that we purchased in these two cloakrooms. [Applause.] If

he wishes to have the sandwiches wrapped, very well, but to say no more milk, oranges, coffee, apples, or sandwiches shall be served in the cloakroom because, forsooth, it is "insanitary" is just a little bit incredulous—yes, worse—but I will say no more for the present.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15712, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15712, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15712) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, on December 17, 1928, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT], in a prepared address before the House, among other things, stated:

For eight years I have heard Presidents' messages of prosperity, of dollars and cents, until materialism has become nauseating. Not once has ever been mentioned education, refinement, the arts, the sciences, honesty, morality, patriotism, or Christianity. Think of the President confining an entire address on George Washington to his farms, his slaves, his business ability, and material prosperity!

For the consideration of the gentleman from Kentucky and others who may be like minded, I offer the following quotations from the addresses, proclamations, and messages of Presidents Harding and Coolidge and suggest the serious reading of the documents in full. Copies are obtainable either at the White House, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have arranged the quotations and references of President Coolidge's addresses in two divisions in chronological order. The first group are inaugural addresses and messages to Congress. The second are addresses on other and varied occasions, all of which have appeared in printed form.

Warren G. Harding, in his inaugural address upon assuming the Presidency, stated:

Standing in this presence, mindful of the solemnity of this occasion, feeling the emotions which no one may know until he senses the great weight of responsibility for himself, I must utter my belief in the divine inspiration of the founding fathers. Surely there must have been God's intent in the making of this New World Republic. * * *

I would rejoice to acclaim the era of the Golden Rule and crown it with the autocracy of service. The world upheaval has added heavily to our tasks, but with the realization comes the surge of high resolve, and there is reassurance in belief in the God-given destiny of our Republic. If I fear that there is to be sole responsibility in the Executive for the America of to-morrow, I should shrink from the burden. But here are a hundred millions, with common concern and shared responsibility, answerable to God and country. The Republic summons them to their duty, and I invite cooperation.

I accept my part with single mindedness of purpose and humility of spirit and implore the favor and guidance of God in His heaven. With these I am unafraid and confidently face the future.

I have taken the solemn oath of office on that passage of Holy Writ wherein it is asked, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" This I pledge to God and country.

In an address to a joint session of the two Houses on April 12, 1921, President Harding said in part:

No government is more desirous than our own to reflect the human attitude, the purpose of making better citizens—physically, intellectually, spiritually.

In the realms of education, public health, sanitation, conditions of workers in industry, child welfare, proper amusement and recreation, the elimination of social vice, and many other subjects the Government has already undertaken a considerable range of activities.

President Harding in his Thanksgiving proclamation in 1921 said in part:

Ours has been a favored Nation in the bounty which God has bestowed upon it. * * *

It is for us to recognize that we have been thus favored, and when we gather at our altars to offer up thanks we will do well to judge, in humility and all sincerity, our purpose to prove deserving. We have been raised up and preserved in national power and consequence as part of a plan whose wisdom we can not question. Thus believing, we can do no less than hold our Nation the willing instrument of the Providence which has so wonderfully favored us. Opportunity for very great service awaits us if we shall prove equal to it. Let our prayers be raised for direction in the right paths. Under God our responsibility is great; to our own first, to all men afterwards; to all mankind in God's own justice.

President Harding, in his first annual address to Congress, December 6, 1921, said in part:

Through the eradication of illiteracy and the diffusion of education mankind has reached a stage where we may fairly say that in the United States equality of opportunity has been attained, though all are not prepared to embrace it.

Proclaiming December 3-9, 1922, as American education week, President Harding stated in part:

The ideals of democratic government and democratic education were planted simultaneously in our country. The fathers rightly believed that only a people trained to vision of public needs and duties could develop and maintain the institutions of popular government. The system of universal education, established in the beginnings, has developed with the country and become one of the characteristic features of our life.

"Without vision the people perish." Without education there can be little vision. Of education it may be said that "It is twice blest; it blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

The strength and security of the Nation will always rest in the intelligent body of its people. Our education should implant conceptions of public duty and private obligation broad enough to envisage the problems of a greatly distraught world. More than anything else men and women need the capacity to see with clear eye and to contemplate with open, unprejudiced mind, the issues of these times. Only through a properly motivated and generously inspired process of education can this be accomplished.

President Harding, in his address to Congress December 8, 1922, said in part:

From the very beginning public education has been left mainly in the hands of the States. * * * I believe in the cooperation of the national authority to stimulate, encourage, and broaden the work of the local authorities.

President Coolidge closed his annual message delivered to a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives in December, 1923, with these words:

The world has had enough of the curse of hatred and selfishness, of destruction and war. It has had enough of the wrongful use of material power. For the healing of the nations there must be good will and charity, confidence and peace. The time has come for a more practical use of moral power, and more reliance upon the principle that right makes its own might. Our authority among the nations must be represented by justice and mercy. It is necessary not only to have faith, but to make sacrifices for our faith. The spiritual forces of the world make all its final determinations. It is with these voices that America should speak. Whenever they declare a righteous purpose there need be no doubt that they will be heard. America has taken her place in the world as a Republic—free, independent, powerful. The best service that can be rendered to humanity is the assurance that this place will be maintained.

President Coolidge closed his message to the Congress, December 3, 1924, with these words:

It is axiomatic that our country can not stand still. It would seem to be perfectly plain from recent events that it is determined to go forward. But it wants no pretenses, it wants no vagaries. It is determined to advance in an orderly, sound, and common-sense way. It does not propose to abandon the theory of the Declaration that the people have inalienable rights which no majority and no power of government can destroy. It does not propose to abandon the practice of the Constitution that provides for the protection of these rights. It believes that within these limitations, which are imposed not by the fiat of man but by the law of the Creator, self-government is just and wise. It is convinced that it will be impossible for the people to provide their own government unless they continue to own their own property.

These are the very foundations of America. On them has been erected a Government of freedom and equality, of justice and mercy, of education and charity. Living under it and supporting it the people

have come into great possessions on the material and spiritual sides of life. I want to continue in this direction. I know that the Congress shares with me that desire. I want our institutions to be more and more expressive of these principles. I want the people of all the earth to see in the American flag the symbol of a Government which intends no oppression at home and no aggression abroad, which in the spirit of a common brotherhood provides assistance in time of distress.

On March 4, 1925, President Coolidge became the elected President of the United States. In his inaugural address upon that occasion he said:

We need not concern ourselves much about the rights of property if we will faithfully observe the rights of persons. Under our institutions their rights are supreme. It is not property but the right to hold property, both great and small, which our Constitution guarantees. All owners of property are charged with a service. These rights and duties have been revealed, through the conscience of society, to have a divine sanction. The very stability of our society rests upon production and conservation. For individuals or for governments to waste and squander their resources is to deny these rights and disregard these obligations. The result of economic dissipation to a nation is always moral decay.

Here stands our country, an example of tranquillity at home, a patron of tranquillity abroad. Here stands its Government, aware of its might but obedient to its conscience. Here it will continue to stand, seeking peace and prosperity, solicitous for the welfare of the wage earner, promoting enterprise, developing waterways and natural resources, attentive to the intuitive counsel of womanhood, encouraging education, desiring the advancement of religion, supporting the cause of justice and honor among the nations. America seeks no earthly empire built on blood and force. No ambition, no temptation, lures her to thought of foreign dominions. The legions which she sends forth are armed, not with the sword, but with the cross. The higher state to which she seeks the allegiance of all mankind is not of human, but of divine origin. She cherishes no purpose save to merit the favor of Almighty God.

In his message to the Congress at the beginning of the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, in 1925, President Coolidge said in part:

The Government ought always to be alert on the side of the humanities. It ought to encourage provisions for economic justice for the defenseless. It ought to extend its relief through its national and local agencies, as may be appropriate in each case, to the suffering and the needy. It ought to be charitable.

The Government of the United States has been created by the people. It is solely responsible to them. It will be most successful if it is conducted solely for their benefit. All its efforts would be of little avail unless they brought more justice, more enlightenment, more happiness and prosperity into the home. This means an opportunity to observe religion, secure education, and earn a living under a reign of law and order. It is the growth and improvement of the material and spiritual life of the Nation. We shall not be able to gain these ends merely by our own action. If they come at all, it will be because we have been willing to work in harmony with the abiding purpose of a Divine Providence.

President Coolidge closed his message to the Congress at the beginning of the second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, December 7, 1926, with these words:

America is not and must not be a country without ideals. They are useless if they are only visionary; they are only valuable if they are practical. A nation can not dwell constantly on the mountain tops. It has to be replenished and sustained through the ceaseless toll of the less inspiring valleys. But its face ought always to be turned upward, its vision ought always to be fixed on high.

We need ideals that can be followed in daily life, that can be translated into terms of the home. We can not expect to be relieved from toll, but we do expect to divest it of degrading conditions. Work is honorable; it is entitled to an honorable recompense. We must strive mightily, but having striven there is a defect in our political and social system if we are not in general rewarded with success. To relieve the land of the burdens that came from the war, to release to the individual more of the fruits of his own industry, to increase his earning capacity and decrease his hours of labor, to enlarge the circle of his vision through good roads and better transportation, to place before him the opportunity for education both in science and in art, to leave him free to receive the inspiration of religion, all these are ideals which deliver him from the servitude of the body and exalt him to the service of the soul. Through this emancipation from the things that are material, we broaden our dominion over the things that are spiritual.

I have quoted the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky in which he said:

Think of the President confining an entire address on George Washington to his farms, his slaves, his business ability, and material prosperity.

I have been unable to find an address of either Presidents Harding or Coolidge that meets that description. It is assumed by several who heard the gentleman's statement that he referred to an address of President Coolidge before the Congress in joint session February 22, 1927, given in response to a request of the Congress asking that the address be given reminding the American people of the reason and purpose for holding a celebration on February 22, 1932, of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington.

Assuming that that is the address to which reference was made, I shall quote more fully than from other addresses of President Coolidge. Discussing the plans, he stated:

When the plans begin to be matured they should embrace the active support of educational and religious institutions, of the many civic, social, and fraternal organizations, agricultural and trade associations, and of other numerous activities which characterize our national life.

Discussing President Washington, President Coolidge in that address stated, among other things:

A recital of his courage and patriotism, his loyalty and devotion, his self-sacrifice, his refusal to be king, will always arouse the imagination and inspire the soul of everyone who loves his country. Nothing can detract from the exalted place which this record entitles him to hold. But he has an appeal even broader than this, which to-day is equally valuable to the people of the United States. Not many of our citizens are to be called on to take high commands or to hold high public office. We are all necessarily engaged in the ordinary affairs of life. As a valuable example to youth and to maturity, the experience of Washington in these directions is worthy of much more attention than it has received.

It ought always to be an inspiration to the young people of the country to know that from earliest youth Washington showed a disposition to make the most of his opportunities. He was diligently industrious—a most admirable and desirable, if seemingly uninteresting, trait.

The boy might well have grown up with very little education, but his eager mind and indomitable will led him to acquire learning and information despite the handicaps surrounding him.

His formal schooling, which was of a rather primitive character, ended at the age of 13. When his regular instruction ended, his education was just beginning. It continued up to his death, December 14, 1799. If ever there was a self-made man, it was George Washington. Through all his later years he was constantly absorbing knowledge from contact with men, from reading whenever time and facilities permitted, and from a wide correspondence.

Although considerable has been written about it, not many people think of our first President as an agriculturist. He prepared a treatise on this subject. Those who have studied this phase of his life tell us he was probably the most successful owner and director of an agricultural estate in his day. A visitor in 1785 declared "Washington's greatest pride was to be thought the first farmer in America." Toward the end of his life he wrote:

"I am led to reflect how much more delightful to an undebauched mind is the task of making improvements on the earth than all the vain glory which can be acquired from ravaging it by the most uninterrupted career of conquests."

As President he was always an exponent of sound and honest public finance. He advocated the payment of our debts in full to holders of record, and the assumption by the Nation of the debts incurred by the various States to carry on the Revolution. His support of financial integrity, because it was morally right, strengthened the Union.

His ability as a business man was the strong support of his statesmanship. It made his political ideas intensely practical.

Washington was a builder—a creator. He had a national mind. He was constantly warning his countrymen of the danger of settling problems in accordance with sectional interests. His ideas in regard to the opening of our western territory were thought out primarily for the benefit of the Nation. It has been said that he would have been "the greatest man in America had there been no Revolutionary War."

Washington had the ability to translate ideals into the practical affairs of life. He was interested in what he believed contributed to the betterment of every-day existence. Perhaps because he realized the deficiency of his own early education, he was solicitous to provide liberal facilities for the youth of the future. Because as a man of affairs he knew the every-day uses of learning, in an early message to the Congress and in his will he sought methods for the establishment of a national university. Even in his Farewell Address we find this exhortation:

"Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

He desired his system of education to be thoroughly American and thoroughly national. It was to support the people in a knowledge

of their rights, in the creation of a republican spirit, and in the maintenance of the Union.

It was with the same clear vision that he looked upon religion. For him there was little in it of emotionalism. He placed it on a firmer, more secure foundation, and stated the benefits which would accrue to his country as the results of faith in spiritual things. He recognized that religion was the main support of free institutions. In his Farewell Address he said:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

"Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle. It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?"

Without bigotry, without intolerance, he appeals to the highest spiritual nature of mankind. His genius has filled the earth. He has been recognized abroad as "the greatest man of our own or any age." He loved his fellow men. He loved his country. That he entrusted their keeping to a Divine Providence is revealed in the following prayer which he made in 1794:

"Let us unite, in imploring the Supreme Ruler of Nations, to spread His holy protection over these United States; to turn the machinations of the wicked, to the confirming of our Constitution; to enable us, at all times, to root out internal sedition and put invasion to flight; to perpetuate to our country that prosperity which His goodness has already conferred; and to verify the anticipations of this Government being a safeguard of human rights."

His accomplishments were great because of an efficiency which marked his every act and a sublime, compelling faith in the ultimate triumph of the right. As we study his daily life, as we read his letters, his diaries, his State papers, we come to realize more and more his wisdom, his energy, and his efficiency.

We have seen many soldiers who have left behind them little but the memory of their conflicts, but among all the victors the power to establish among a great people a form of self-government which the test of experience has shown will endure was bestowed upon Washington, and Washington alone. Many others have been able to destroy. He was able to construct. That he had around him many great minds does not detract from his glory. His was the directing spirit, without which there would have been no independence, no Union, no Constitution, and no Republic. His ways were the ways of truth. He built for eternity. His influence grows. His stature increases with the increasing years. In wisdom of action, in purity of character, he stands alone. We can not yet estimate him. We can only indicate our reverence for him and thank the Divine Providence which sent him to serve and inspire his fellow men.

In the message to the Congress at the beginning of the first session of the Seventieth Congress, December 6, 1927, President Coolidge closed with these words:

Our country has made much progress. But it has taken, and will continue to take, much effort. Competition will be keen, the temptation to selfishness and arrogance will be severe, the provocations to deal harshly with weaker peoples will be many. All of these are embraced in the opportunity for true greatness. They will be overbalanced by cooperation, by generosity, and a spirit of neighborly kindness. The forces of the universe are taking humanity in that direction. In doing good, in walking humbly, in sustaining its own people, in ministering to other nations, America will work out its own mighty destiny.

President Coolidge closed his message to the Congress December 4, 1928, at the beginning of the second session of the Seventieth Congress, with these words:

The country is in the midst of an era of prosperity more extensive and of peace more permanent than it has ever before experienced. But, having reached this position, we should not fail to comprehend that it can easily be lost. It needs more effort for its support than the less exalted places of the world. We shall not be permitted to take our ease, but shall continue to be required to spend our days in unremitting toil. The actions of the Government must command the confidence of the country. Without this our prosperity would be lost. We must extend

to other countries the largest measure of generosity, moderation, and patience. In addition to dealing justly we can well afford to walk humbly.

The end of government is to keep open the opportunity for a more abundant life. Peace and prosperity are not finalities; they are only methods. It is too easy under their influence for a nation to become selfish and degenerate. This test has come to the United States. Our country has been provided with the resources with which it can enlarge its intellectual, moral, and spiritual life. The issue is in the hands of the people. Our faith in man and God is the justification for the belief in our continuing success.

September 26, 1923, Calvin Coolidge issued a national education week proclamation stating, among other things:

From its earliest beginnings America has been devoted to the cause of education. This country was founded on the ideal of ministering to the individual. It was realized that this must be done by the institutions of religion and government. In order that there might be a properly educated clergy and well-trained civil magistrates, one of the first thoughts of the early settlers was to provide for a college of liberal culture, while for the general diffusion of knowledge primary schools were established. This course was taken as the necessary requirement of enlightened society.

Such a policy, once adopted, has continued to grow in extent. With the adoption of the Federal Constitution and the establishment of free governments in the States of the Union there was additional reason for broadening the opportunity for education. Our country adopted the principle of self-government by a free people. Those who were worthy of being free were worthy of being educated. Those who had the duty and responsibility of government must necessarily have the education with which to discharge the obligations of citizenship. The sovereign had to be educated. The sovereign had become the people. Schools and universities were provided by the various governments, and founded and fostered by private charity, until their buildings dotted all the land.

To insure the permanence and continuing improvement of such an educational policy there must be the fullest public realization of its absolute necessity. Every American citizen is entitled to a liberal education. Without this there is no guaranty for the permanence of free institutions, no hope of perpetuating self-government. Despotism finds its chief support in ignorance. Knowledge and freedom go hand in hand.

February 12, 1924, before the National Republican Club in New York City, President Coolidge said:

Character is the only secure foundation of the State. The forces of evil do not long triumph. The power of justice can not long be delayed. The moral force of Lincoln is with us still. "He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep."

Addressing the luncheon of the Associated Press at New York City, April 22, 1924, President Coolidge said:

Little progress can be made by merely attempting to repress what is evil, our great hope lies in developing what is good. One newspaper is better than many criminal laws. One schoolmaster is better than a legion of bailiffs. One clergyman is better than an army with banners. These are our guaranties of internal peace and progress.

At the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, May 22, 1924, President Coolidge said:

I want to see all Americans have a reasonable amount of leisure. Then I want to see them educated to use such leisure for their own enjoyment and betterment, and the strengthening of the quality of their citizenship. We can go a long way in that direction by getting them out of doors and really interested in nature. We can make still further progress by engaging them in games and sports. Our country is a land of cultured men and women. It is a land of agriculture, of industries, of schools, and of places of religious worship. It is a land of varied climes and scenery, of mountain and plain, of lake and river. It is the American heritage. We must make it a land of vision, a land of work, of sincere striving for the good, but we must add to all these, in order to round out the full stature of the people, an ample effort to make it a land of wholesome enjoyment and perennial gladness.

At the Confederate Memorial at Arlington, May 25, 1924, President Coolidge said:

If I am correctly informed by history, it is fitting that the Sabbath should be your Memorial Day. This follows from the belief that except for the forces of Oliver Cromwell no army was ever more thoroughly religious than that which followed General Lee. Moreover, these ceremonies necessarily are expressive of a hope and a belief that rise above the things of this life. It was Lincoln who pointed out that both sides prayed to the same God. When that is the case, it is only a matter of time when each will seek a common end. We can now see clearly what that end is. It is the maintenance of our American form of government, of our American institutions, of our American ideals, beneath a common flag, under the blessings of Almighty God.

A mightier force than ever followed Grant or Lee has leveled both their hosts, raised up a united Nation, and made us all partakers of

a new glory. It is not for us to forget the past but to remember it, that we may profit by it. But it is gone; we can not change it. We must put our emphasis on the present and put into effect the lessons the past has taught us. All about us sleep those of many different beliefs and many divergent actions. But America claims them all. Her flag floats over them all. Her Government protects them all. They all rest in the same divine peace.

At Howard University, June 6, 1924, President Coolidge, in an address to the student body, said:

The accomplishments of the colored people in the United States, in the brief historic period since they were brought here from the restrictions of their native continent, can not but make us realize that there is something essential in our civilization which gives it a special power. I think we shall be able to agree that that particular element is the Christian religion, whose influence has always and everywhere been a force for the illumination and advancement of the peoples who have come under its sway.

At Georgetown University commencement, June 9, 1924, President Coolidge said:

* * * a continuing elimination of the uncomfortable tasks, of course, means a corresponding increase in human happiness. But this will not be possible, unless intellectual progress keeps step with the demand for higher technical, scientific, and social capabilities. That is why the progress of education must always be a primary concern to us.

The graduates of our higher institutions of learning have been mentally well equipped to take their part. If they shall fail, it will not be through lack of intelligence. Their success will be measured by the method with which they apply themselves. It will depend upon whether they choose the solid and substantial things and put their trust in the realities of life. It will not be so much a question of what they know as of how they use what they know. They can not meet the problems in life unless they have a foundation of character, and unless they are inspired by a moral purpose. It is necessary to be active and energetic and courageous, but it is necessary likewise to have humility. It is necessary to have knowledge and experience and wisdom, and keep the mind open for new truths; but it is necessary likewise to have abiding religious convictions.

I would not venture to say what our country needs most from its educated young men and women, but one of its urgent needs is a greater spirit of loyalty, which can only come from reverence for constituted authority, from faith in the things that are. There must be loyalty to the family; loyalty to the various civic organizations of society; loyalty to the Government, which means first of all the observance of its laws; and loyalty to religion. These are fundamental virtues. They are the chief characteristics of faith. If education has not given that clearer insight into all that touches our life, whether it come from our relationship to the physical world, or our relationship to mankind, it will be a disappointment and a failure. If it has given that insight, it will be a success; it will be the source of that power through which alone has been, and can be, "wrought many wonderful works."

At the convention of the National Education Association, Washington, D. C., July 4, 1924, President Coolidge stated:

Our country has not ceased to glory in its strength, but it has come to a realization that it must have something more than numbers and wealth, something more than a fleet and an army, to satisfy the longing of the soul. It knows that to power must be added wisdom, and to greatness must be added morality. It is no longer so solicitous to catalogue the powers which it possesses, as to direct those great forces for the spiritual advancement of the American people at home and the discharge of the obligations to humanity abroad. America is turning from the things that are seen to the things that are unseen.

That there could have been gathered together a body of men so learned in that science, so experienced in its application, so talented and so wise in its statement and demonstration, as those who proposed, formulated, and secured the adoption of the American Constitution, will never cease to be the wonder and admiration of the profoundest students of government. After making every allowance for a fortunate combination of circumstances and the accomplishments of human ingenuity, they have been nearly all forced to come to the belief that it can be accounted for only by the addition of another element, which we must recognize as the guiding hand of Providence. As we can make progress in science not by the disregard but by the application of the laws of mathematics, so in my firm conviction we can make progress politically and socially, not by a disregard of those fundamental principles which are the recognized, ratified, and established American institutions, but by their scrupulous support and observance.

Through it all (the Declaration of Independence) runs the recognition of the dignity and worth of the individual, because of his possession of those qualities which are revealed to us by religion.

It needed but little contemplation to determine that the greatest obstacle to freedom was ignorance. If there was to be self-government,

if there was to be popular sovereignty, if there was to be an almost unlimited privilege to vote and hold office, if the people were going to maintain themselves and administer their own political and social affairs, it was necessary as a purely practical matter that they should have a sufficiently trained and enlightened intelligence to accomplish that end. Popular government could only be predicated on popular education. In addition to this, the very conception of the value and responsibility of the individual, which made him worthy to be intrusted with this high estate, required that he should be furnished the opportunity to develop the spiritual nature, with which he was endowed, through adequate education.

The land was blessed with a great people and with great leaders. Washington and Jefferson, Franklin and Mason, Hamilton and Madison, Adams and Marshall, suggest a type of citizenship and leadership, of scholarship and statesmanship, of wisdom and character, of ability and patriotism, unsurpassed by any group of men ever brought together to direct the political destinies of a nation.

While I believe that educators are under obligation to expend public funds economically, it seems obvious that the recent increase in expenses for this purpose is a most wise investment. It is impossible to conceive that there should be any increase in agricultural products, in the production of manufactures, or any other increase in our material wealth, through ignorance. The reaction to using the resources of the country to develop the brains of the country through education has always been greatly to stimulate and increase the power of the people to produce.

As already indicated America is turning from the mere thought of the material advantage to a greater appreciation of the cultural advantage of learning. It is coming to be valued more and more for its own sake. People desire not only the intelligence to comprehend economic and social problems, but they are finding increased leisure is little more than time wasted in indulgence, unless an opportunity for self-development and self-expression has been provided in youth by the cultivation of a taste for literature, history, and the fine arts.

Another element must be secured in the training of citizenship, or all else will be in vain. All of our learning and science, our culture, and our arts will be of little avail unless they are supported by high character, unless there be honor, truth, and justice, unless our material resources are supported by moral and spiritual resources, there is no foundation for progress. A trained intelligence can do much, but there is no substitute for morality, character, and religious convictions. Unless these abide American citizenship will be found unequal to its task.

We are not yet free, but we are struggling to become free economically, socially, politically, spiritually.

A new importance is attaching to the cause of education. A new realization of its urgent necessity is taking hold of the Nation.

It is intent, as never before, upon listening to the word of the teacher, whether it comes from the platform, the schoolhouse, or the pulpit. The power of evil is being broken. The power of the truth is reasserting itself. The Declaration of Independence is continuing to justify itself.

August 14, 1924, President Coolidge, in his address of acceptance of the nomination for the Presidency, said:

Underneath and upholding political parties was, and is, the enduring principle that a true citizen of a real republic can not exist as a segregated, unattached fragment of selfishness, but must live as a constituent part of the whole of society, in which he can secure his own welfare only as he secures the welfare of his fellow men.

Party means political cooperation, not as an end in itself, but a means, an instrument of government. If founded upon a great moral principle and directed with scrupulous regard for its integrity, it can not fail to sweep onward and upward, advancing always steadily and surely, a mighty constructive force, a glorious bearer of progress.

The domestic affairs of our country appear to me to be by far the chief concern. From that source comes our strength. The home market consumes nearly all of our production. Within our own boundaries will be determined to a very large degree the economic welfare and the moral worth of the American people. These are plain facts, but there are others equally plain.

America, under Providence, has come to be a nation of great responsibility. It exists as one of the family of nations. We can not be isolated. Other peoples exist all about us. Their actions affect us, and our actions affect them, whether we will or no. Their financial condition is not and can not be entirely separated from our financial condition. But the final determination of our relationship to other countries rises into a higher realm. We believe in the brotherhood of man, because we believe in the fatherhood of God. That is our justification for freedom and equality.

Our country can not afford to let anyone live off the earnings of its youth of tender years. Their places are not in the factory, but in the school, that the men and women of to-morrow may reach a higher state of existence and the Nation a higher standard of citizenship.

In the commonplace things of life lies the strength of the Nation. It is not in brilliant conceptions and strokes of genius that we shall find the chief reliance of our country, but in the home, in the school, and in religion. America will continue to defend these shrines. Every evil force that seeks to desecrate or destroy them will find that a Higher Power has endowed the people with an inherent spirit of resistance. The people know the difference between pretense and reality. They want to be told the truth. They want to be trusted. They want a chance to work out their own material and spiritual salvation.

President Coolidge closed an address to the Association of Land Grant Colleges, November 13, 1924, in Washington, D. C., with these words:

Finally, you will remember that America has but one great staple product. We till the soil, we operate our industries, we develop transportation, we engage in commerce, we encourage the arts and sciences, but these are only means to an end. They are all carried on in order that America may produce men and women worthy of our standards of citizenship. We want to see them endowed with ability and character, with patriotism and religious devotion. We want to see them truly American, while ready and eager to contribute a generous share to world welfare. We want to see them honest, industrious, and independent, possessed of all those virtues which arise from an adequate moral and intellectual training joined to experiences which come from the open country.

November 14, 1924, President Coolidge began a proclamation designating American Education Week with these words:

Education for the children of all the people, extending from the primary grades through the university, constitutes America's noblest contribution to civilization. No child or youth in the United States need be deprived of the benefits of education suited to his age and degree of advancement.

Addressing the National Conference on Utilization of Forest Products at Washington, D. C., November 19, 1924, President Coolidge said:

We hold the resources of our country as a trust. They ought to be used for the benefit of the present generation, but they ought neither to be wasted nor destroyed. The generations to come also have a vested interest in them. They ought to be administered for the benefit of the public. No monopoly should be permitted which would result in profiteering, nor on the other hand should they be indiscriminately bestowed upon those who will unwisely permit them to be dissipated. These great natural resources must be administered for the general welfare of all the people, both for the present and for the future.

Addressing the International Livestock Exposition at Chicago, December 4, 1924, President Coolidge said:

We are entitled, I think, to look upon livestock as one of the most highly developed products of the agricultural industry. To bring that industry to its present high estate has required a continuing cooperation of unfagging industry, determined courage, sound business, a widespread and intelligent application of scientific methods, and the recognition of the practical advantages to be derived from our American system of agricultural education. This annual exposition has marked perhaps more accurately than any other index the steady progression of agriculture from an unorganized and rudimentary occupation to the point where it has taken on the character of a profession, and has summoned to its aid the most effective methods in business organization, economic analysis, and scientific methods.

At the Norwegian centennial celebration at the Minnesota State Fair Grounds, June 8, 1925, President Coolidge said:

Our America with all that it represents of hope in the world is now and will be what you make it. Its institutions of religious liberty, of educational and economic opportunity, of constitutional rights, of the integrity of the law, are the most precious possessions of the human race. These do not emanate from the Government. Their abiding place is with the people. They come from the consecration of the father, the love of the mother, and the devotion of the children. They are the product of that honest, earnest, and tireless effort that goes into the rearing of the family altar and the making of the home of our country.

At Cambridge, Mass., July 3, 1925, President Coolidge spoke on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of George Washington taking command of the Continental Army and said:

Wherever men love liberty, wherever they believe in patriotism, wherever they exalt high character, by universal consent they turn to the name of George Washington. No occasion could be conceived more worthy, more truly and comprehensively American, than that which is chosen to commemorate this divinely appointed captain. The contemplation of his life and work will forever strengthen our faith in our country and in our country's God.

Others have created wider commotion and deeper impression in the hour of their eminence. But we shall hardly find one who in his own

day achieved so much as Washington and left his work so firmly established that posterity, generation after generation, can only increase its tributes to his ability, his wisdom, his patriotism, and his rounded perfection in the character of a Christian citizen.

Addressing the Council of the Congregational Churches at Washington, D. C., October 20, 1925, President Coolidge said:

It is my understanding that the purpose of this council is to enlarge and improve the moral and spiritual life of the Nation. While I appreciate that its purpose is religious rather than political, I have felt a propriety in coming here because of my belief in the necessity for a growing reliance of the political success of our Government upon the religious convictions of our people.

In the progress of the human race religious beliefs were developed before the formation of governments. It is my understanding that government rests on religion. While in our own country we have wisely separated the church and the State in order to emancipate faith from all political interference, nevertheless the forms and theories of our Government were laid in accordance with the prevailing religious convictions of the people. The great revival of the middle of the eighteenth century had a marked influence upon our Revolutionary period. The claim to the right to freedom, the claim to the right to equality, with the resultant right to self-government—the rule of the people—have no foundation other than the common brotherhood of man derived from the common fatherhood of God. The righteous authority of the law depends for its sanction upon its harmony with the righteous authority of the Almighty. If this faith is set aside, the foundations of our institutions fail, the citizen is deposed from the high estate which he holds as amenable to a universal conscience, society reverts to a system of class and caste, and the government instead of being imposed by reason from within is imposed by force from without. Freedom and democracy would give way to despotism and slavery. I do not know of any adequate support for our form of government except that which comes from religion. The very fact that amid all the complexities and distractions of our present life we are still maintaining unimpaired the foundations of our institutions, constantly increasing the rectitude with which the great business affairs of our country are conducted, all the while improving our educational facilities, answering more and more generously to the calls of public and private charity, continually enlarging the field of art, giving more and more attention to the humanities, and becoming more and more responsive to spiritual things, appears to me to be incontrovertible evidence that though it may be practiced in a somewhat different manner than formerly the deep and abiding faith of our people in religion has not diminished but has increased.

I have tried to indicate what I think the country needs in the way of help under present conditions. It needs more religion. If there are any general failures in the enforcement of the law, it is because there have first been general failures in the disposition to observe the law. I can conceive of no adequate remedy for the evils which beset society except through the influences of religion. There is no form of education which will not fail, there is no form of government which will not fail, there is no form of reward which will not fail. Redemption must come through sacrifice, and sacrifice is the essence of religion. It will be of untold benefit if there is a broader comprehension of this principle by the public and a continued preaching of this crusade by the clergy. It is only through these avenues, by a constant renewal and extension of our faith, that we can expect to enlarge and improve the moral and spiritual life of the Nation. Without that faith all that we have of an enlightened civilization can not endure.

Addressing the International Convention of the Young Men's Christian Associations of the United States and Canada at Washington, D. C., October 24, 1925, President Coolidge said:

One of the chief characteristics of Christianity is that it is a militant and crusading faith. Those who have become partakers of its inspirations and its consolations, since it first began its early march over the hostile territory of the Roman Empire, have been constantly spreading its truths among all their associates. If that faith is to maintain its vitality that work must go on. It is not enough that there should be action in the pulpits—there must be reaction in the pews. It will not be sufficient to have exalted preaching by the clergy unless there is exalted living by the laity.

Special emphasis is being placed upon the need of training for citizenship. Not only by the general development of character, by encouraging industry and discouraging waste, are they strengthening the community and raising up leaders, but by informing the young respecting the teachings of the New Testament and of the Hebrew prophets they are providing them with a grasp on the principles which must underlie all enduring civilization.

America has many reasons for pride and satisfaction in the spirit and character of its citizenship. It is gratifying to know that it has the resources with which to make these outlays and perform these services. We ought to be thankful in remembering that our own people do not need to receive this kind of assistance from any other people. We are able to look after our own. But that which rises above all other

considerations is the fact that our people are imbued with a religious charity which makes them disposed to extend these benefits to those who are less fortunately circumstanced at home and abroad. There are those who constantly reprove our people and our Government for an alleged failure to assist other peoples. I do not know that anyone could ever say that we were doing enough, but it is my strong suspicion that those who are making the loudest complaints have never taken the trouble to ascertain what we have done and what we are doing. It is gratifying beyond measure to realize how the steady, courageous, generous hand of the real America continues to reach out to those in need. It stands as a conclusive answer to all censorious criticism. These works stamp America with a continuing effort working for moral regeneration.

December 7, 1925, President Coolidge addressed the American Farm Bureau Federation at Chicago and closed with these words:

In all our economic discussions we must remember that we can not stop with the mere acquisition of wealth. The ultimate result to be desired is not the making of money but the making of people. Industry, thrift, and self-control are not sought because they create wealth but because they create character. These are the prime product of the farm. We who have seen it and lived it, we know.

It is this life that the Nation is so solicitous to maintain and improve. It dwells in the open country, among the hills and valleys and over the great plains, in the unobstructed light of the sun, and under the glimmer of the stars. It brings its inhabitants into an intimate and true relation to nature, where they can live in harmony with the Great Purpose. It has been the life of freedom and independence, of religious convictions and abiding character. In its past it has made and saved America and helped rescue the world. In its future it holds the supreme promise of human progress.

February 22, 1926, in an address before the department of superintendence of the National Education Association, President Coolidge closed with these words:

Our country has prospered, our Government is secure. But that prosperity and that security flow from the school and the church. They are the product of the mind and the soul. They are the result of the character of the American people. Through and through Washington is the great example of character. He sought to bestow that heritage upon his country. We shall fail in our estimation and understanding of him unless we remember that during his lifetime he helped to build a place of religious worship; in his will he provided for institutions of learning, and in his farewell address he emphasized the spiritual values of life. But what he did was even more eloquent than what he said. He was a soldier, a patriot, a statesman; but in addition to all these he was a great teacher.

Laying the corner stone of the National Press Club Building in Washington, D. C., April 8, 1926, President Coolidge said:

It is my firm conviction that the press of this country is strong enough, independent enough, and influential enough so that it should seek not to cater to a supposed low and degraded public opinion, but rather to create a noble and inspired public opinion. It ought to work in harmony with a great purpose, revealing to the people the progress of the development of a Divine power.

There is another side to journalism perhaps most important of all. No enterprise can obtain a success which is worth anything unless it appeals to the spiritual nature of mankind. No matter how secular the efforts may be of a publication, it will fail of the largest attainments, will not meet the highest requirements, will not secure the widest influence unless it is moved by a reverence for religion. Our country is a reverent country and our people are a reverent people. Our institutions must rest on that foundation. The press must minister to that spirit. Their great work must go on, like all other great works, in reliance upon a divine purpose. If the corner stone which we are laying to-day is to endure, it must represent these principles. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

At Washington, D. C., April 19, 1926, before the Daughters of the American Revolution, President Coolidge spoke as follows:

However exalted is the conception of our institutions, they are not beyond the reach of the common run of people. They are ideal, but they are practical. They rest on the everyday virtues—honesty, industry, and thrift. As the overwhelming mass of our people are thoroughly loyal to these principles, we can feel a warranted assurance that the foundations of our institutions are secure.

Our Republic gives to its citizens greater opportunities, and under it they have achieved greater blessings than ever came to any other people. It is exceedingly wholesome to stop and contemplate that undisputed fact from time to time. Then, it is necessary to contemplate the inescapable corollary that the enjoyment and perpetuation of these conditions necessarily lay upon our people the obligation of a corresponding service and sacrifice. Citizenship in America is not a private enterprise, but a public function. Although I have indicated that it is my firm conviction that this requirement will be met, it can not be

denied that if it is not met disaster will overtake the whole fabric of our institutions.

Addressing the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, Washington, D. C., May 1, 1926, President Coolidge said:

We hear much talk of the decline in the influence of religion, of the loosening of the home ties, of the lack of discipline—all tending to break down reverence and respect for the laws of God and of man. Such thought as I have been able to give to the subject and such observations as have come within my experience have convinced me that there is no substitute for the influences of the home and of religion. In the past I have declared my conviction that our Government rests upon religion; that religion is the source from which we derive our reverence for truth and justice, for equality and liberty, and for the rights of mankind.

We need a greater faith in the strength of right living. We need a greater faith in the power of righteousness. These are the realities which do not pass away. On these everlasting principles rests the movement of the Boy Scouts of America. It is one of the growing institutions by which our country is working out the fulfillment of an eternal promise.

At Philadelphia, July 5, 1926, celebrating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, President Coolidge spoke as follows:

It is little wonder that people at home and abroad consider Independence Hall as hallowed ground and revere the Liberty Bell as a sacred relic. That pile of bricks and mortar, that mass of metal, might appear to the uninstructed as only the outgrown meeting place and the shattered bell of a former time, useless now because of more modern conveniences, but to those who know they have become consecrated by the use which men have made of them. They have long been identified with a great cause. They are the framework of a spiritual event. The world looks upon them, because of their associations of 150 years ago, as it looks upon the Holy Land because of what took place there nineteen hundred years ago. Through use for a righteous purpose they have become sanctified.

The American Revolution represented the informed and mature convictions of a great mass of independent, liberty-loving, God-fearing people who knew their rights and possessed the courage to dare to maintain them.

No one can examine this record and escape the conclusion that in the great outline of its principles the Declaration was the result of the religious teachings of the preceding period. The profound philosophy which Jonathan Edwards applied to theology, the popular preaching of George Whitefield, had aroused the thought and stirred the people of the Colonies in preparation for this great event.

But when we come to a contemplation of the immediate conception of the principles of human relationship which went into the Declaration of Independence we are not required to extend our search beyond our own shores. They are found in the texts, the sermons, and the writings of the early colonial clergy who were earnestly undertaking to instruct their congregations in the great mystery of how to live. They preached equality because they believed in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. They justified freedom by the text that we are all created in the divine image, all partakers of the divine spirit.

If this apprehension of the facts be correct, and the documentary evidence would appear to verify it, then certain conclusions are bound to follow. A spring will cease to flow if its source be dried up; a tree will wither if its roots be destroyed. In its main features the Declaration of Independence is a great spiritual document. It is a declaration not of material but of spiritual conceptions. Equality, liberty, popular sovereignty, the rights of man—these are not elements which we can see and touch. They are ideals. They have their source and their roots in the religious convictions. They belong to the unseen world. Unless the faith of the American people in these religious convictions is to endure, the principles of our Declaration will perish. We can not continue to enjoy the result if we neglect and abandon the cause.

We are too prone to overlook another conclusion. Governments do not make ideals, but ideals make governments. This is both historically and logically true. Of course, the government can help to sustain ideals and can create institutions through which they can be the better observed, but their source by their very nature is in the people. The people have to bear their own responsibilities. There is no method by which that burden can be shifted to the government. It is not the enactment, but the observance of laws, that creates the character of a nation.

We hold that the duly authorized expression of the will of the people has a divine sanction. But even in that we come back to the theory of John Wise that "Democracy is Christ's government. * * *." The ultimate sanction of law rests on the righteous authority of the Almighty.

On an occasion like this a great temptation exists to present evidence of the practical success of our form of democratic republic at home and the ever-broadening acceptance it is securing abroad. Although these things are well known, their frequent consideration is an encouragement and an inspiration. But it is not results and effects so much as sources and causes that I believe it is even more necessary constantly to contemplate.

Our forefathers came to certain conclusions and decided upon certain courses of action which have been a great blessing to the world. Before we can understand their conclusions we must go back and review the course which they followed. We must think the thoughts which they thought. Their intellectual life centered around the meeting house. They were intent upon religious worship. While there were always among them men of deep learning, and later those who had comparatively large possessions, the mind of the people was not so much engrossed in how much they knew or how much they had as in how they were going to live. While scantily provided with other literature there was a wide acquaintance with the Scriptures. Over a period as great as that which measures the existence of our independence they were subject to this discipline not only in their religious life and educational training, but also in their political thought. They were a people who came under the influence of a great spiritual development and acquired a great moral power.

No other theory is adequate to explain or comprehend the Declaration of Independence. It is the product of the spiritual insight of the people. We live in an age of science and of abounding accumulation of material things. These did not create our Declaration. Our Declaration created them. The things of the spirit come first. Unless we cling to that, all our material prosperity, overwhelming though it may appear, will turn to a barren scepter in our grasp. If we are to maintain the great heritage which has been bequeathed to us, we must be like-minded as the fathers who created it. We must not sink into a pagan materialism. We must cultivate the reverence which they had for the things that are holy. We must follow the spiritual and moral leadership which they showed. We must keep replenished, that they may glow with a more compelling flame the altar fires before which they worshipped.

At the annual convention of the American Red Cross in Washington, D. C., October 4, 1926, President Coolidge spoke as follows:

The main purpose of this organization is charity, but charity is not something that can exist of itself, apart from all else. It is a very complete demonstration of the fact that we live in a world that is interrelated and interdependent. Charity depends not only on a benevolent spirit but upon the material resources by means of which such a sentiment can manifest itself.

It is the realization of this principle that helps to sanctify the realm of business. The people of this country are engaged in their various daily occupations in order that they may meet their wide and comprehensive obligations. No doubt their first thought is to be self-supporting and independent, maintaining themselves and their families in comfort, supplying the needs of their declining years, and passing on to posterity the means of a broader existence and a more comprehensive life. It is with this in view that they have given heed to the scriptural injunction to be diligent in business, and under the inspiration of this motive America has become rich and prosperous. But our obligation does not end there. Although there is no doubt that we have surpassed every other people in that direction we have not yet attained, and perhaps it is not possible for finite beings to attain, to a complete economic justice. The limitations of humanity and the results of unforeseen and unforeseeable contingencies constantly leave some of our people, oftentimes without any fault on their part, in a condition of want and distress which they are unable of themselves to alleviate. Nothing is clearer than the requirement which is laid on society to use its resources for the relief and restoration of such conditions. The success and completeness with which these obligations are discharged measure the moral rank of a people.

It is to meet this broad purpose that the American Red Cross has been organized and maintained.

More and more each year it has become a symbol and expression of the divine sympathy which exists in every human being.

What the Red Cross is doing is only one example of the innumerable results of American idealism. While there is no more moving spectacle than that of the poor, out of their meager substance, extending relief to their fellow beings in time of distress, such relief would be entirely inadequate to meet the needs of modern society. To extend medical aid, to give the necessary food, clothing, and shelter to the victims of disaster in the crowded areas of the world, either in war or peace, require great outlays of money and large aggregates of personal service. This can only be furnished from the resources of wealth and prosperity. The fact that these charities are supplied not only for the Red Cross but in innumerable other directions is one of the most complete demonstrations that our people in their effort to accumulate property are moved by a righteous purpose. Their success has not been turned to

greed, avarice, or selfishness, but has been productive of generosity, benevolence, and charity.

After all the ideal charity is to place in the hands of the people the means of satisfying their own requirements through their own efforts.

It is for these reasons that it is necessary to rely so largely upon the economic condition of the country to minister to the idealism of the country. We may be moved ever so strongly with benevolent impulses; but if we are without means to afford relief, such sentiments are of little practical value. Even where generosity and wealth both exist we can not say that even these are sufficient. After all, human nature does not want permanent charity but permanent independence through the opportunity to work out its own destiny. It is at this point that the economic well-being and prosperity of a nation passes over into the ideal. Great wealth belonging to a few is not a condition that we seek in this country, but rather a system of production and distribution where the great mass of people shall be contributors to the process and shall share in the rewards. Under this system, toward which we are constantly advancing in America, prosperity and idealism merge, and the cause of economics serves the cause of humanity. The higher idealism, the true philanthropy, is not that which comes to the rescue after the catastrophe, but rather that which through obedience to sound economic laws creates a prosperity among the people that anticipates and prevents the need of charity.

Before the American Association of Advertising Agencies at Washington, October 27, 1926, President Coolidge spoke as follows:

Sometimes it seems as though our generation fails to give the proper estimate and importance to the values of life. Results appear to be secured so easily that we look upon them with indifference. We take too many things as a matter of course, when in fact they have been obtained for us only as the result of ages of effort and sacrifice. We look at our economic condition upon which we are absolutely dependent for the comforts and even the necessities of life, and forgetting that it all rests on industry, thrift, and management, dismiss it lightly as a matter that does not concern us. Occasionally our attention is directed to our political institutions, which have been secured for us through the disinterested exertion of generations of patriotism, and, going along oblivious to the fact that they are the sole guarantees of our rights to life and liberty, we turn away with the comforting thought that we can let some party committee attend to getting out the vote and that probably the Government will run itself all right anyway. Then perhaps we are attracted by the buildings erected for education, or the temples dedicated to religious worship, and without stopping to realize that these are the main source of the culture of society and the moral and spiritual life of the people we pass them by as the concern very largely of schoolmasters and clergymen. We have become so accustomed to the character of our whole, vast, and intricate system of existence that we do not ordinarily realize its enormous importance.

These results, however, can not be considered as guaranteed by our material resources alone. They will accrue to us, not because of our fertile agricultural fields, our deposits of coal, iron, and precious metals, nor even from the present state of our development of trade with its accompanying supports of manufacturing, transportation, and finance. We can not rely on these alone. They could all be turned into instruments of destruction. Our chief warrant for faith in the future of America lies in the character of the American people. It is our belief in what they are going to do, rather than our knowledge of what they are going to have, that causes us to face the coming years with hope and confidence. The future of our country is not to be determined by the material resources, but by the spiritual life of the people. So long as our economic activities can be maintained on the standard of competition in service, we are safe. If they ever degenerate into a mere selfish scramble for rewards, we are lost. Our economic well-being depends on our integrity, our honor, our conscience.

President Coolidge closed his address dedicating the Liberty Memorial at Kansas City, November 11, 1926, with these words:

While we recognize the obligations arising from the war and the common dictates of humanity which ever bind us to a friendly consideration for other people, our main responsibility is for America. In the present state of the world that responsibility is more grave than it ever was at any other time. We have to face the facts. The margin of safety in human affairs is never very broad, as we have seen from the experience of the last dozen years. If the American spirit fails, what hope has the world? In the hour of our triumph and power we can not escape the need for sober thought and consecrated action. These dead whom we here commemorate have placed their trust in us. Their living comrades have made their sacrifice in the belief that we would not fail. In the consciousness of that trust and that belief this memorial stands as our pledge to their faith, a holy testament that our country will continue to do its duty under the guidance of a Divine Providence.

On the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battles of Trenton and Princeton, December 29, 1926, at Trenton, President Coolidge said:

Washington and his generals are gone. The bloody tracks which their barefoot armies often left on the frozen ground have long since been washed away. The smoke of the conflict in which they engaged has cleared. The civil strife and disorder which followed have been dissipated. But the institutions which they founded, the Government which they established, have not only remained, but have grown in strength and importance and extended their influence throughout the earth. We can never go to their assistance with supplies and reinforcements. We can never lend our counsel to their political deliberations. But we can support the Government and institutions which are their chief titles to the esteem and reverence in which they are held by the common consent of all humanity.

Our country has traveled far since these soul-inspiring days. Our progress has been great. Our prosperity has been the wonder of the world. Our present-day existence has its difficulties, requiring courage and resourcefulness. The political and economic life of the Nation offers abundant opportunity for developing the character and increasing the moral power of the people. I believe it to be a grave error to assert that the spiritual force of the men and women of the Revolutionary period was superior to that which exists in the America of the present. But they did set for us an example which no nation can ignore and long exist.

The Colonies of those days had little in the way of accumulated wealth, but by hard work the people on the whole maintained themselves in comfort. Those conditions, as everyone knows, have been radically changed. Through the development of our natural resources, our inventive genius, and mechanical skill this Nation has become possessed of very large wealth. Such a situation has its dangers. In past history it has usually led first to luxury and ease and later to decline and decay. We do not yet appear to be tending in that direction. While we have a considerable extent of what might be called luxury, it is not of that destructive nature which has in the past afflicted other people. In a wide measure it is for use rather than display. It makes its appeal to the soul rather than to the senses.

We are placing a great deal of emphasis on prosperity. Our people ought to desire to be prosperous, but it ought not to be their main desire. There are other things that they ought to want more. Prosperity is not a cause; it is a result. It is not based on indolence and ease, on avarice and greed, or on selfishness and self-indulgence. It is the result of industry, fair dealing, self-denial, and generosity. It is all summed up in a single word. It is character. If the country will put its emphasis on this process and remember to practice these virtues, its prosperity will become greater and greater, and the greater it becomes the more worthy it will be of our admiration. A more efficient service, one to another, will be the foundation of a greater prosperity and of a stronger national character.

The whole record of American success is traceable to the excellence of American citizenship.

*** Under our institutions the only way to perfect our Government is to perfect the individual citizen. It is necessary to reach the mind and the soul of the individual. It is not merely a change of environment but a change of heart that is needed. The power of the law may help, but only the power of righteousness can be completely sufficient. I know of no way that this can be done save through the influences of religion and education. By religion I do not mean either fanaticism or bigotry; by education I do not mean the cant of the schools; but a broad and tolerant faith, loving thy neighbor as thyself, and a training and experience that enables the human mind to see into the heart of things.

At the annual session of the American Medical Association, May 17, 1927, Washington, D. C., President Coolidge said:

One of the difficulties in the world is not that we are lacking in sufficient knowledge, but that we are unwilling to live in accordance with the knowledge which we have. Approbation of the Ten Commandments is almost universal. The principles they declare are sanctioned by the common consent of mankind. We do not lack in knowledge of them. We lack in ability to live by them.

It is to your profession in its broadest sense, untrammelled by the contentions of different schools, that the world may look for large contributions toward its regeneration, physically, mentally, and spiritually, when not force but reason will hold universal sway. As human beings gain in individual perfection, so the world will gain in social perfection, and we may hope to come into an era of right living and right thinking, of good will, and of peace, in accordance with the teachings of the Great Physician.

At the memorial exercises at Arlington, May 30, 1927, President Coolidge said:

We have robbed no people of their independence, we have laid on no country the hand of oppression. When our military forces have taken the field it has been to enlarge the area of self-government, to extend

the scope of freedom, and to defend the principles of liberty. We have established our independence, resisted encroachment upon our sovereignty, maintained our national union, rescued afflicted people from their oppression, and brought victory to the cause of liberty in a world convulsion. To all of our departed dead who, on land and on sea, have offered their blood in the support of this holy and triumphant cause, America to-day brings its affectionate garlands of honor and acclaim.

As Americans we are always justified in glorying in our own country. While offensive boastfulness may be carried to the point of reproach, it is much less to be criticized than an attitude of apologetic inferiority. Not to know and appreciate the many excellent qualities of our own country constitutes an intellectual poverty which instead of being displayed with pride ought to be acknowledged with shame. While pride in our country ought to be the American attitude, it should not include any spirit of arrogance or contempt toward other nations. All people have points of excellence and are justly entitled to the honorable consideration of other nations. While this land was still a wilderness there were other lands supporting a high state of civilization and enlightenment. On the foundation which they had already laid we have erected our own structure of society. Their ways may not always be our ways, and their thoughts may not always be our thoughts, but in accordance with their own methods they are attempting to maintain their position in the world and discharge their obligations to humanity. We shall best fulfill our mission by extending to them all the hand of helpfulness, consideration, and friendship. Our own greatness will be measured by the justice and forbearance which we manifest toward others.

If we desire to be an influence in order and law, tranquility and good will in the world, we must be determined to make sufficient sacrifices to live by these precepts at home. We can be a moral force in the world only to the extent that we establish morality in our own country.

Addressing the First International Congress of Soil Science, June 13, 1927, at Washington, D. C., President Coolidge said:

Science is not confined within any national boundaries. Its achievements and its benefits, like the achievements and benefits of all truth, are at the service of the world for the lightening of human labor and the enrichment of human life.

Dedicating Wicker Memorial Park to World War veterans, June 14, 1927, at Hammond, Ind., President Coolidge said:

The immediate aim of these efforts is to improve the public health. It is realized that sound bodies mean an increased industrial efficiency. But the purpose goes beyond this to the cleansing and clarifying of the mind, raising the whole standard of life. It is becoming better and better understood that a sound body, an informed mind, normal social contacts, and that contentment which comes from opportunity for a broader self-expression, are all vital factors in the preservation of our national existence. The significance of this development is triumphantly American. In this country the sciences, the arts, the humanities, are not reserved for a supposed aristocracy, but for the whole of the people. Here we do not extend privilege to a few, we extend privilege to everybody. That which was only provided for kings and nobles in former days, we bestow freely on the people at large. The destiny of America is to give the people still more royal powers, to strengthen their hand for a more effective grasp upon the scepter.

We are also possessors of human strength. Intelligence, courage, fidelity, character—these, also, are our heritage and our mark of the Divine Image.

Amid all her prosperity America has not forgotten her ideals. As a people we stand in respectful reverence before the things that are unseen. It is but a passing glance that we bestow upon wealth and place, compared with that which we pour out upon courage, patriotism, holiness, and character. We dedicate no monuments to merely financial and economic success, while our country is filled with memorials to those who have done some service for their fellow men.

No one who is acquainted with history, who observes what is all about us, can fail to cherish the hope that we are entering on a wonderful future. It has been said that the war was fought to make a world fit for the abode of heroes. I want to see our own country the first to make that expectation a reality. But if it is to come true, it can only be through the industry, the devotion, and the character of the people themselves. The Government can help to provide opportunity, but the people must take advantage of it.

At Brookings, S. Dak., September 10, 1927, dedicating the Lincoln Memorial Library, President Coolidge said:

In communities such as these the cause of education has never failed to hold a very high place. Of course, the people in their daily life would give their first thought to religious worship, but in the affairs of government education has come to be predominant. No progressive community can afford to neglect the education of its people. It is impossible for any community to hold its place in modern society unless it is fully equipped in the educational field of arts and sciences and research.

All of our science and all of our arts will never be the means for the true advancement of our Nation, will never remove us from the sphere of the superficial and the cynical, will never give us a civilization and a culture of any worthy and lasting importance unless we are able to see in them the outward manifestation of a spiritual reality. Unless our halls of learning are real temples which are to be approached by our youth in an attitude of reverence, consecrated by worship of the truth, they will all end in a delusion. The information that is acquired in them will simply provide a greater capacity for evil. Our institutions of learning must be dedicated to a higher purpose. The life of our Nation must rise to a higher realm.

But these colleges are important not only because of the economic results which have accrued from them but even more because of their spiritual value. They are of great benefit in the domain of land and the various products of the soil, but in the domain of thought they have an even more important influence. Our whole country is yet comparatively young. We have been driven by necessity to giving a great deal of attention to subduing the forces of nature. It has been necessary to create anew on this continent all of the instruments of civilization. We have had our cities to build, our highways, our railroads, and our canals to lay out, our mines and manufacturing to put into operation, our banking and commerce, as well as our agriculture, to organize, and our political and our social problems to solve. All of these have made necessary a great supply of material resources for their creation and support.

We have been excessively busy seeking for information that could be turned to practical advantage in the matter of dollars and cents, rather than for that wisdom which would guide us through eternity. Our higher educational institutions have turned their thoughts especially to the sciences, and our secondary schools to vocational training. How important these are in my estimation will appear from what I have already said. How poor and weak and generally ineffective we should be without these advantages can be at once seen by the most casual observation of those nations among which they have been neglected.

This is by no means all that is to be expected from American education and American institutions. I can not conceive that the object of Abraham Lincoln was merely to instruct men how to raise more corn, to feed more hogs, to get more money, to buy more land, and so on, in the expanding circle, as the story goes. Of course, he wanted to teach men to raise more corn, but his main object must have been to raise better men. We come back to the query that is contained in the concentrated wisdom of the ages, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

We should all of us remember Lincoln as the great emancipator, the President who guided the Nation through four years of internal conflict, who demonstrated beyond future question the national quality of our institutions and the indestructibility of our Union, who removed forever from our soil the stain of human slavery, and who possessed a God-given insight into the hearts of the American people. But these elements of his greatness should not be permitted to eclipse the mighty service which he rendered to the cause of vocational education by his advocacy and approval of the measure which established what are usually referred to as our State agricultural colleges.

At the annual observance of Founders' Day at Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 13, 1927, President Coolidge said:

It is a fundamental principle of our institutions that freedom, education, and wealth are not to be reserved for the few but are to be reached through equal opportunity which is open to all. We have staked America on the potential capacity of the average citizen.

There are still some who sit apart, who do not see, who can not understand. To them our industrial life is the apotheosis of selfishness. They can not realize that the rattle of the reaper, the buzz of the saw, the clang of the anvil, the roar of traffic are all part of a mighty symphony not only of material but of spiritual progress. Out of them the Nation is supporting its religious institutions, endowing its colleges, providing its charities, furnishing adornments of architecture, rearing its monuments, organizing its orchestras, and encouraging its painting. But the American people see and understand. Unperturbed, they move majestically forward in the consciousness that they are making their contribution in common with our sister nations to the progress of humanity.

Speaking before the Union League at Philadelphia, November 17, 1927, President Coolidge said:

America is much more than a geographical location. It is a combination and a relationship. It is the destiny of a masterful, pioneering people, enduring all the hardships of settling a new country, determined to be free. It is the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution, with a system of local self-government. It is the development of the farm, the factory, and the mine, the creation of a surpassing commerce, and the opening of vast lines of travel by sea and land, with broadening opportunity for education and freedom for religious worship. Our country is the result of incomprehensible

triumph, conferring upon its own people untold material and spiritual rewards and indirectly raising the standards of the world. It is a combination of all these elements, with their past history and their present aspirations, that we refer to as America.

While we have not neglected religion and education, we have considered our welfare in the past mainly on its economic side. Our population has increased rapidly over a considerable space of years. We have received large numbers of foreign people. For the most part they were vigorous, enterprising, and of good character, but almost always without money and too often without learning. Due to the exigencies of frontier life, many of our native-born have found themselves in a similar situation. To form all these people into an organization where they might not merely secure a livelihood, but by industry and thrift have the opportunity to accumulate a competency, such as has been done in this country, is one of the most marvelous feats ever accomplished by human society. It could never have been done without the utmost of private and public attention to the business side of life. Yet it has been done. The task is by no means complete, but the framework has been erected and no one can deny that the construction is making steady progress.

The object of this economic endeavor has not been the making of money for its own sake. It certainly has not been for the purpose of endowing an aristocracy with wealth. It has been fostered and encouraged by the Government in order to provide the people at large with sufficient incomes to raise their standards of living to a position worthy of a free and enlightened nation. In the carrying out of this mighty project, which in its conception and its execution has never been surpassed by any effort for human advancement, our inhabitants have found the added benefit of a corresponding development of character. The results have reached into the humblest home in the land, carrying hope and cheer with the knowledge that the door of opportunity has been opened to them.

We have sought to establish a system under which the people would control the Government, and not the Government control the people. If economic freedom vanishes, political freedom becomes nothing but a shadow.

Those are some of the economic results which have accrued from the American principle of reliance upon the initiative and the freedom of the individual. It is the very antithesis of communism, but it has raised the general welfare of the people to a position beyond even the promises of the extremists. Arising from this same principle is popular education, the right to justice, free speech, and free religious worship, all of which we cherish under the general designation of liberty under the law.

We have demonstrated that we were able to meet adversity and overcome it. The test which now confronts the Nation is prosperity. There is nothing more likely to reveal the soul of a people. History is littered with stories of nations destroyed by their own wealth. It is true that we have accumulated a small but a blatant fringe of extravagance and waste, nourished in idleness, and another undesirable class who seek to live without work. A successful people are always a mark for the vicious and the criminal. But these are conspicuous mainly by contrast. The great mass of our people, whatever their possessions, are conscientious and industrious, seeking to serve humanity. They know that the doctrine of ease is the doctrine of surrender and decay. To the effort which built this country they are giving increased effort to maintain it. The heart of the Nation is sound.

Society is made up of constants and variables. The variables attract us by their contrasts and are always appearing in the headlines. But the constants always predominate, always push ahead in the march of progress. We hear enough of criticism, we hear enough of the evil; but we must not forget commendation, we must not forget the good. This is our Government. This is our society. This is our country. It is solid, sound, secure. It is for us to put forth sufficient effort to keep it so.

Addressing the Pan American conference at Habana, Cuba, January 16, 1928, President Coolidge stated:

The fertility of a virgin soil, a wealth of mineral deposits, an abundance of water power, a multitude of navigable rivers, all at the command of a resourceful people, have produced a material prosperity greater in amount and more widely distributed than ever before fell to the lot of the human race. The arts and sciences have flourished, the advantages of education are widespread, devotion to religion is marked by its sincerity. The spirit of liberty is universal. An attitude of peace and good will prevails among our nations.

While the law is necessary for the proper guidance of human action, and will always remain the source of freedom and liberty and the ultimate guaranty of all our rights, there is another element in our experience which must always be taken into consideration. We read that "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." Oftentimes in our international relationship we shall have to look to the spirit rather than to the letter of the law. We shall have to realize that the highest law is consideration, cooperation, friendship, and charity. Without the application of these there can be no peace and no progress, no liberty, and no republic. These are the attributes that raise human relationships out of the realm of the mechanical, above the realm of animal existence,

into the loftier sphere that borders on the divine. If we are to experience a new era in our affairs, it will be because the world recognizes and lives in accordance with this spirit. Its most complete expression is the Golden Rule.

The light which Columbus followed has not failed. The courage that carried him on still lives. They are the heritage of the people of Bolivar and of Washington. We must lay our voyage of exploration toward complete understanding and friendship. Having taken that course, we must not be turned aside by the fears of the timid, the counsels of the ignorant, or the designs of the malevolent. With law and charity as our guides, with that ancient faith which is only strengthened when it requires sacrifices, we shall anchor at last in the harbor of justice and truth. The same Pilot which stood by the side of the great discoverer, and the same Wisdom which instructed the founding fathers of our republics, will continue to abide with us.

Addressing a joint meeting of the American Federation of Arts and the American Association of Museums, Washington, D. C., May 16, 1928, President Coolidge stated:

While we have been devoted to the development of our material resources, as a Nation ought to be which heeds the admonition to be diligent in business, we have not been neglectful of the higher things of life. In fact, I believe it can be demonstrated that the intellectual and moral awakening which characterized our people in their early experiences was the forerunner and foundation of the remarkable era of development in which we now live. But in the midst of all the swift-moving events we have an increasing need for inspiration. Men and women become conscious that they must seek for satisfaction in something more than worldly success. They are moved with a desire to rise above themselves. It is but natural, therefore, that we should turn to the field of art.

We refer to painting, sculpture, the adornments of architecture, music, poetry, and the drama as fine arts. More recently we have designated the perfection and refinement of the design of articles fabricated by modern machinery as industrial arts. But in a wider sense the arts include all those manifestations of beauty created by man which broaden and enrich life. It is an attempt to transfer to others the highest and best thoughts which the race has experienced. The self-expression which it makes possible rises into the realm of the divine.

It is especially the practical side of art that requires more emphasis. We need to put more effort into translating art into the daily life of the people. If we could surround ourselves with forms of beauty, the evil things of life would tend to disappear and our moral standards would be raised. Through our contact with the beautiful we see more of the truth and are brought into closer harmony with the infinite.

Our country has reached a position where this is no longer a visionary desire but is becoming an actual reality. With general prosperity, with high wages, with reasonable hours of labor has come both the means and the time to cultivate the artistic spirit. Philanthropy has given the people access to all that is most beautiful in form and color. It is theirs without money and without price, if they will but go and possess it. Out of our agriculture, our commerce, and our industry, we can already see emerging a new spirit. The potential is becoming actual. Through science and invention, gradually but surely, we are banishing the drudgery of existence and bringing into every avenue of living a touch of the artistic. We are working out the ideal under which everyone will realize that they are artists, in their employment, in their recreation, and in their relations, one with another.

Speaking at Andover, Mass., May 19, 1928, on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Phillips Academy, President Coolidge said:

For our chartered institutions of learning to turn back to the material and neglect the spiritual would be treason, not only to the cause for which they were founded, but to man and to God.

When the cause of the Revolution still hung in the balance, when this school was conducted in an abandoned carpenter shop, before our Federal Constitution had made our scattered colonies into one nation, when authority was weak and all the future was uncertain, the patriots of that day offered life, fortune, and honor in defense of their country. They did not doubt; they did not complain. They went forward, placing their hope on the sure support of liberty and justice, the improvement of agriculture, industry, and commerce, and the advance of education. The day has come when we have seen their hope fulfilled, when we have seen their faith justified, and when success has demonstrated the correctness of their theories. The general advance made by our country is commensurate with the advance which has been made by Phillips Academy. As we behold it our doubts ought to be removed, our faith ought to be replenished. Our determination to make such sacrifices as are necessary for the common good ought to be strengthened. We may be certain that our country is altogether worthy of us. It will be necessary to demonstrate that we are worthy of our country.

Dedicating a memorial to Col. William Colvill at Cannon Falls, Minn., July 29, 1928, President Coolidge said:

Heroic deeds have about them an element of immortality. We stand in reverence before those who perform them and cherish their memory down through the ages because we recognize in them the manifestation

of a spiritual life, the evidence of things not seen, a presence which was without beginning and is without end, a power that lifts men above the things of this earth into the realm of the divine.

Because we believe in the reality of right and truth and justice and recognize the necessity of supporting them with every necessary sacrifice, including life itself, we could not be engaged in any more devotional action than in reverencing the memory of those who have nobly responded to that high conception of eternal duty.

We may well stop to consider on this Sabbath Day what Power it was that stationed these men at this strategic point on this occasion, which held so much of the hope of humanity. We can only infer that it was the same Power which guided the path of the *Mayflower*, which gave our country Franklin and Washington, which brought this northwestern territory into the Union through the miraculous victory of George Rogers Clark at Vincennes and peopled it with a freedom-loving immigration, which raised up Lincoln and Grant, which went to the rescue of liberty in Cuba and on the fields of France. Was it not the same Power which set these men as its sentinels on that July day to guard the progress of humanity? As we behold it all we can but conclude in the words of Holy Writ that, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

It has been demonstrated that what never could have been created under a condition of servitude is the almost natural result of a condition of freedom. Human nature has been so designed that men are only at their best when they are permitted to live like men. It is when they are released from the bondage of the body, given control over their own actions, receive the returns from their own labor, and released from bondage of the mind so that ignorance and superstition are replaced by education and moral influences that most progress is made toward an enlightened civilization.

It is in accordance with these conceptions that we have come to-day to dedicate this memorial and to rededicate ourselves to the support and preservation of those principles which have been revealed to us through the human understanding to be true and demonstrated through long experience to be sound. We have come to increase our admiration for all that is heroic in life, to express our reverence for those who have made sacrifices for the well-being of their fellow men, to renew our fealty to the Constitution of the United States, to rejoice in the universal freedom which it guarantees and in the perfect Union which it has created, and finally for all these blessings in gratitude and humility to acknowledge our dependence upon the Giver of every true and perfect gift.

Addressing the general convention of the Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., October 10, 1928, President Coolidge said:

This general convention of the Episcopal Church, which is held once in three years, represents organized religious life and missionary effort in every part of the globe. Many thousands are taking part in it. Considered by itself alone it constitutes an activity of the greatest importance. But when we remember that it is but one of many similar organizations, some larger and some smaller, all devoted to the service of religion, we can not escape the conclusion that the major forces of the world are actively and energetically engaged in promoting the spiritual advancement of humanity.

The advancement of knowledge, the increase in science, the growth and distribution of wealth, the enactment of laws, while they may all be commendable or even necessary in themselves, do not alone meet the problem of human existence or furnish a sufficient foundation for human progress. Man is more than all these. He requires the inspiration of a higher motive to meet the demands of a spiritual nature. They might furnish a partial explanation of an Alexander, a Caesar, or a Napoleon. They fall utterly to account for a Hampden or a Cromwell, a Washington or a Lincoln, or for the long list of sacrificing missionaries, saints, and martyrs who have devoted their lives to the higher cause of humanity. Organized government and organized society have done much and can do much. Their efforts will always be necessary, but without the inspiration of faith, without devotion to religion, they are inadequate to serve the needs of mankind. It is in that direction that we must look for the permanent sources of the ministrations of charity, the kindness of brotherly love, and the renunciation of consecrated lives.

Our country is thoroughly committed to a life of action. We expect our people to put forth great energy and great effort in perfecting the material structure of our national life, in enlarging our production, in increasing our commerce, in strengthening our agriculture, in improving our transportation, in organizing our finances. But all these things will never be done for their own sake. They are not an end in themselves. They are but a means to a nobler character and a higher life. Unless that motive is provided from some other source, these activities inevitably lead back to the conclusion that the end justifies the means and that might makes right. We are not seeking an increased material welfare that leads to materialism; we are seeking an increased devotion to duty that leads to spiritual life. Such an effort would be in vain, unless our Nation as a whole continued in its devotion to religion.

We can not remind ourselves too often that our right to be free, the support of our principles of justice, our obligations to each other in our domestic affairs, and our duty to humanity abroad, the confidence in each other necessary to support our social and economic relations, and finally the fabric of our Government itself, all rest on religion. Its importance can not be stressed too often or emphasized too much. If the bonds of our religious convictions become loosened, the guaranties which have been erected for the protection of life and liberty and all the vast body of rights that lie between are gone. The debt which this country owes to the men and women down through the ages who have been teaching and are teaching to-day the cause of righteousness is beyond all estimation. So long as the great body of our people continue to be inspired by their example, and to be faithful to their precepts, our institutions will remain secure and our civilization will continue in its increase of material and spiritual welfare.

In an address at Fredericksburg, Va., October 19, 1928, dedicating the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial, President Coolidge stated:

• • • This Nation is something vastly more than an expanse of territory. It has reached the high place which it holds in the world largely because of its institutions of government.

These figures, which would be cold and uninteresting in themselves, when we realize that they illustrate the life and development of our country, can not fail to have a deep fascination. But those wonderful records would be of little avail, if they were not accompanied by evidences of the moral power of the Nation. Education is on the increase. Our charities are lavish and world-wide. Our missionary efforts reach in every direction. Our actions in behalf of limitation of naval armaments have been of great benefit to all mankind. Our influence in negotiating the recent treaty in behalf of peace is well known. It raises the greatest barrier against war that was ever created by the art of man. Our progress and prosperity at home, our standing and influence abroad, could never have been secured unless they rested on a solid foundation of demonstrated integrity, high character, and abiding faith.

Such are some of the outlines of the mansion in which dwell the people of the United States. It is "a house not made with hands." Into it have gone the sacrifices and prayers of many generations. While it is by no means complete, it is already the most comfortable habitation which a nation ever enjoyed. Its prevailing atmosphere is marked by progress, peace, and tranquillity. Sectional animosities have disappeared. Industrial conflicts have almost ceased. Her territorial integrity is secure. Her constitutional liberties are protected by the eternal vigilance of her people. Our country is still worthy of those who have made such great sacrifices in its behalf, still determined to improve the opportunities which those sacrifices created, still loyal to the faith of the past, still inspired by the hope of the future.

In an address upon the observance of the tenth anniversary of the armistice, under the auspices of the American Legion November 11, 1928, Washington, D. C., President Coolidge said:

As we contemplate the past 10 years, there is every reason to be encouraged. It has been a period in which human freedom has been greatly extended, in which the right of self-government has come to be more widely recognized. Strong foundations have been laid for the support of these principles. We should by no means be discouraged because practice lags behind principle. We make progress slowly and over a course which can tolerate no open spaces. It is a long distance from a world that walks by force to a world that walks by faith. The United States has been so placed that it could advance with little interruption along the road of freedom and faith.

It is befitting that we should pursue our course without exultation, with due humility, and with due gratitude for the important contributions of the more ancient nations which have helped to make possible our present progress and our future hope. The gravest responsibilities that can come to a people in this world have come to us. We must not fail to meet them in accordance with the requirements of conscience and righteousness.

Addressing the National Grange convention, in Washington November 16, 1928, President Coolidge said:

The last half century has seen many organizations formed in the name of agriculture, usually to relieve some local or national distress. When conditions have improved the organization has disappeared. But the National Grange, having a much broader basis, has continued without interruption a long and useful existence. The main reason for this has been the sound foundation on which it stands. It has not devoted its efforts to the treatment of local and temporary symptoms, but with a wider and more penetrating view it has sought to eradicate causes. It has been interested in securing prosperity, improving living conditions, and encouraging education; but primarily it has stood for the development of the men, women, and children of the farm in intelligence, character, and moral worth. Realizing that these are

the most important products of life in the open country, it has never failed to place upon them its main emphasis.

The great strength of the farm in our national life lies in the farm home. It has been the prime source from which have sprung the ability and the character of the Nation. Those who suggest that the farmer is in danger of being reduced to a state of peasantry entirely disregard the inherent independence and resourcefulness that is bred in life in the open. That spirit does not depend upon the possession of a large amount of property or income or the price of agricultural products. I was born and raised in such surroundings, and on this subject I know whereof I speak. The danger of the development of the peasant spirit in this country lies in our crowded tenements, which shelter the dependent wage earners of our great centers of population. Under present conditions that menace also is disappearing. From that danger our farm population is the most remote.

Addressing the Pan American Conference on Arbitration and Conciliation, December 10, 1928, President Coolidge said:

It is to no ordinary occasion that I am privileged as President of the United States to bid you welcome. There are represented here 20 nations of the Western Hemisphere, who have a common purpose to advance the cause of civilization by substituting the obligation of reason for the coercion of force. It is an effort to raise humanity to a higher level of existence, where nations may dwell together in peace and harmony according to the principles of liberty and equality under the fostering influence of justice and equity. It is impossible to conceive of a more inspiring motive for an international conference. Here is no shadow of past conflict and no thought of future conquest. All is peace, and all thoughts are bent on establishing a better method through which a higher degree of justice may be done each to the other. We must not only maintain the traditional policy established by the founders of our republics, but we must also carry the procedure of conciliation and arbitration to a new and higher sphere. The world has the right to expect that the mission undertaken by the early statesmen of this continent shall be carried to completion. Our history, our national ideals, and the standards of our international intercourse make this a solemn obligation.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THATCHER). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, with apologies to the House, I will talk on the pending bill. [Laughter.] I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the report of the Surgeon General of the United States Army. While this report might pass unnoticed and without consideration, yet it contains some rather startling statements bearing on the condition and morale of the Army. On page 4 of the report of the Surgeon General for the year 1928 he states that there were 52 deaths which occurred during the year as the result of suicide. This he simply passes off with the statement that this is higher than it has ever been heretofore in the Army. In 1923 there were 44 deaths in the Army from suicide.

Now, gentlemen, if you stop to consider the population of the Army, 132,901, and consider the care, or the supposed care exercised in recruiting, the medical examination, and while in the Army the proper food, genial surroundings, medical care, and the fact that certainly no soldier is ever overworked in time of peace, it seems to me that the War Department is called upon to explain this exceedingly unusual high rate of suicide.

Now, the rate in the United States for the so-called death area per 100,000 in 1925 was 12.1. In 1927 it was 13. Remember that is per 100,000; and here you have 52, or four times a higher rate per 100,000.

Obviously something is wrong somewhere. Perhaps it is the recruiting service. I never thought very much of the recruiting service, especially in New York City, and I know conditions there. In the cities the recruiting service is enlisting mere boys, just lads of 16 or 17, who by their very appearance indicate their age, and getting them into the Army. Then we have trouble. The parents find it out, and they write to us, and at times the demand is made in time to get them out and at times the parents do not learn about the enlistment until the boy gets in trouble.

The Army is either taking the kind of men who should not be enlisted, or else something is radically wrong in the treatment of the men in the Army, because this fact of four times the average number of suicides in the Army is not satisfactorily explained in the Surgeon General's report. I am not criticizing the Surgeon General's report, but I do demand an explanation from the military command of the Army. The War Department owes Congress some explanation of this startling condition.

Perhaps something may be wrong in the discipline of the Army. The paragraph in the report just before the suicide paragraph is a paragraph on alcoholism, and during the same year there were 1,147 admissions into Army hospitals for alcoholism. If the same ratio should exist in New York, we would have 52,927 cases of alcoholism in our city hospitals. Statistics show we have not even one-tenth of that number of cases. If the same ratio existed in the city of Washington, you would have 4,398 cases of alcoholism. Members know that there are not a fraction of such number of cases. The Army figures, the report makes clear, does not include cases where the patient drank denatured or poisoned alcohol. The 1,147 cases of alcoholism resulting from excessive drinking certainly brings the drinking rate of the Army very high. Just imagine a military post, with its sentinels and its guards and all the military discipline that can be imagined, where complete control prevails over the conduct of each man, where no man can enter the post without a permit, where men are all inspected when they leave and when they return, and still have excessive drinking. Of course, everyone knows that every man in the Army who takes a drink is not a patient in the hospital and enumerated in the report from which I am quoting. It just goes to show that prohibition can not be enforced even at the point of a bayonet.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LaGuardia. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Is there any relationship between the number of suicides and the great number of excessive drinkers of alcohol?

Mr. LaGuardia. No. In these cases the suicides are dead and the 1,147 cases of acute alcoholism are alive. There were seven deaths from alcohol, and those are kept separate from the suicides, so that there is no relation between the two at all.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGuardia. Certainly.

Mr. KETCHAM. Has the gentleman any means of ascertaining whether or not the 1,147 cases to which he refers are separate individuals, or are there some repeaters there?

Mr. LaGuardia. I will read the paragraph, because it is very short:

There were 1,147 admissions for the total Army during the year on account of alcoholism.

A man enlists for three years, and it would seem to me that if he were a repeater he would certainly bring himself within the violation of the regulations and be dismissed, so I do not think there could be many repeaters.

That brings me to another question which I want to bring up, and it is that of the 1-year enlistment. I particularly invite the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to this subject. This House has repeatedly expressed itself on that subject. If young men were enlisted for one year they would get the benefit of the training; they would get the physical set-up, and that training and set-up would be an asset to the country. The officers of the Army—or, rather, the General Staff, I will say—has stubbornly and consistently resisted 1-year enlistments. Why? Because if you get a man to enlist for three years, after he learns to drill there is no more work on him. He takes care of himself. It is nothing but laziness on the part of the officers who fight this 1-year enlistment. Under a 1-year enlistment plan there would be drill duty year in and year out; also good for the officers. Men who are enlisted for three years are not generally the energetic, active, and industrious young men who would be attracted to a 1-year enlistment. One-year enlistment would be attractive and it would be interesting for young men willing to take the training and the experience for the short term of one year.

A young man can get all the military training necessary in one year and it would be possible to get the clean-cut type of young Americans. It is hard to get that same type to enlist for three years, and then you get the so-called professional soldier, and the result is seen right here in these two short paragraphs of the Surgeon General's report.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGuardia. Certainly.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Does not the gentleman think the 1-year enlistment system would have a tendency to cut down the ever-increasing number of desertions?

Mr. LaGuardia. Absolutely. I want to call the attention of the committee—and they are giving me no attention at all—to the question of desertion. In the bill you provide money for the payment of a reward of \$50. The evil of this reward is not as bad in the Army as it is in the Navy. This reward has created a new—I will not say profession, but a new calling—that of enticing young men to desert and then reporting them

back in order to collect the reward. I had a case in New York only a few weeks ago of a young man who was named after a former distinguished Speaker of this House, the Hon. Champ Clark. His name was Champ Clark Rose, a Texas boy. He enlisted in the Navy and eventually found his way to New York. There one of these fellows enticed the boy to desert, got him a job, and after the boy was on the job for the required length of time, the same man turned him back to the Navy and got the reward. That is a disgraceful condition, and it is a condition that has existed a long time—to which the attention of the committee has been called, but the committee will not listen to reason. The committee is simply hypnotized when a general with spurs appears before them. They seem to be absolutely hypnotized, and go ahead and appropriate money for the payment of this reward, which, as I have pointed out, creates a disgraceful condition, and the committee will not listen to reason.

I am going to offer an amendment reducing that reward to \$10, and further provide that no police officer is entitled to that reward, because we have occasions where constables and local peace officers work in with these men who entice the boys to desert and then turn them over to the military authorities. The runners get the reward and the boys go to a military prison for six months and then get a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does not the gentleman think it would be wiser to limit the amount that any one man could get in any one year?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, they would get around that easily enough by working in pairs or through dummies. It seems to me those conditions ought to be considered, and that the reward of \$50 ought to be reduced to \$10 so as not to make it sufficiently lucrative for anyone to establish himself in the business of getting boys to desert and then reporting them back.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman knows, of course, that when a boy deserts, the Army and the Navy immediately notify the police authorities of the city or town where he comes from that he is a deserter, and informs them of the \$50 reward, so as to get them busy. In that way they get the man back into the service where he can be court-martialed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman will find that in large centers—and, of course, I am speaking for my own center—just a few men specialize in that kind of work; and I understand that in the last year one man has turned in over 80 cases of deserters to the Navy. So I think the subcommittee should give this proposition careful consideration. After all, committees are only a part of the House, and supposed to reflect the wishes of the House.

I would like to go along with the great Appropriations Committee, because they say the great Appropriations Committee has looked into this, but I do not think the committee is infallible and I do not believe any individual member of that committee is infallible. This matter of the amount paid as a reward for turning back deserters has been called to the attention of the committee almost every year when the bill has been before the House for consideration, but no attention is paid to the matter of reducing the amount.

Now, I hope that the War Department will, in the course of the next few days, inform this House, if it can, as to the cause of this unusually high rate of suicides in the Army, which is four times over the normal in any part of this country. Where you are supposed to have 100,000 men, contented, well clad, well fed, with proper medical care, if the service is anything like it is depicted in the posters; where you have recruiting under high-pressure salesmanship, where you promise these boys that every day in the week will be better than a Sunday on the farm. Some explaining ought to be done.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman give a moment's attention to this phase of the matter? I notice what to me, at least, is a rather astonishing statement, to the effect that \$800,000 is turned into the Treasury each year accruing from discharge by purchase in the Army. If that rate of compensation is \$125 that means that 6,400 of these discharge-by-purchase cases arise every year. Does not the gentleman see some connection between that proposition and the general proposition which he is now discussing?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am very glad the gentleman has called my attention to that. You know it is very difficult to explain to a man why it is necessary for him to purchase his discharge. He simply can not understand it. There is a regular graduated scale for that and there are a great many boys who find the Army anything but what they expected.

Most of the discharge-by-purchase cases are where the boy does not get the military service that he expected. He resents doing a lot of menial work. We used to call it, when I was a little boy, "dog robbing." They do not call it dog robbing any more. A dog robber is a soldier that is assigned to be the servant not only of the officer but of the officer's family. I do not know what they call them now.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In just a moment. I want to touch on this discharge-by-purchase question.

There is no reason, it seems to me, when a boy has fulfilled the military end of his service, where he is a full-fledged soldier, if he desires his discharge and he can show there are home conditions requiring his presence or that he can better himself, he should not be able to get his honorable discharge after one year. I think we ought to provide for an honorable discharge on request after a minimum of one year's service conditioned on good conduct and good service. Upon application in peace time a soldier, if his record is good, should be able to get his discharge without the necessity of purchasing it.

I yield now to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has talked about the matter of desertion and the satisfaction of the enlisted men in the Army. I would like to call the attention of the committee and the gentleman to the fact that in the year 1926 we had 7.26 per cent desertions; in 1927, we had 6.07 per cent; and in the fiscal year 1928, ending last July, we had 5.81 per cent, showing a continual, progressive reduction in the desertions from the Army and indicating that the enlisted men are better taken care of and are better satisfied.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman thinks that 5 per cent is anything to brag about, then I will say to the gentleman that it means 5,000 men deserted from the Army in one year, and it is nothing to brag about. Imagine one complete regiment of desertions.

Mr. TABER. But the improvement is very much to brag about.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, yes; the improvement in two years was 1,000 men. The gentleman from New York or anyone on this floor who knows anything about military service or knows anything about military discipline can take the floor and say, "Hurrah; we are great. We have only 5 per cent desertion." Of course, 5 per cent does not sound much, but it means over 5,000 men deserting the Army in one year. I will tell you that it means a very low morale. You can not get away from that. If you had that percentage of desertions in war time, you would have an army corps doing nothing else but shooting men on the firing line. You would not think of a condition like that under war conditions, where the conditions are really bad; you would not have 5,000 desertions out of 100,000 men, and yet the gentleman from New York wants to brag about it. The Army ought to be ashamed of it.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman states the enlisted men are used as servants by officers and their families.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; as "dog robbers."

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Will the gentleman give the number of enlistments in the last three years that these figures refer to?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know exactly what the turnover is, but the turnover is very great.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Ninety-five per cent, or practically all of the desertions, are men who have only been in the service less than a year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. You know the reenlistments are of the type of men who can adjust themselves to this kind of life and who can not adjust themselves to our highly competitive industrial life; and I insist that a great deal of this evil would be remedied if the staff would not so stubbornly resist 1-year enlistments, and, as pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM], would abolish the discharge by purchase and permit a man who has qualified and who has a good record after one year to be discharged on his own request. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SWANK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, many important bills are pending here that should be enacted into law before the adjournment of this Congress. A farm bill that will give relief to the farmers of our country should have been enacted long ago and many of us here have exerted our every effort in that direction. The farm relief bill should be passed before this short session adjourns. Then a more stringent immigration bill should be passed. I supported the present

immigration law, but too many people from foreign countries are coming to the United States. We must look after our own people first. But, Mr. Chairman, nothing is so important to the citizenship of our country as a strict and vigorous enforcement of all our laws.

I have introduced a bill that I believe would make for better enforcement of our prohibition laws if passed by Congress and approved by the President. I believe the law should be strengthened by a minimum fine and term of imprisonment. Oklahoma has one of the best prohibition laws of any State in the Union, and provides that a conviction for a violation of that act shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$50 nor more than \$500, and by imprisonment for not less than 30 days, nor more than 6 months. Certainty of punishment and imprisonment is what deters the law violator. Under the national prohibition act convictions for the first violation are punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned not exceeding six months, and for a second or subsequent offense the penalty is by a fine of not less than \$200 nor more than \$2,000 and by imprisonment not less than one month nor more than five years. Under the act, the first offense can be punished by a fine of \$1 and for the second offense by a fine of \$200 and one month in prison. A small fine that many times is given violators of this law is only a license to violate it again. Let them know that for the first offense they will have to serve at least 30 days in jail and you will see better enforcement. Then let them know further that for subsequent convictions they will get a longer term in prison. The big bootlegger cares nothing for even the maximum fine of \$2,000 under the present law for a second conviction, but he will care something for a good term in the penitentiary. The present law should be strengthened.

My bill provides a penalty of not less than \$50 nor more than \$10,000 and imprisonment for not less than one month nor more than five years. For a second conviction the bill provides a fine of not less than \$50 nor more than \$10,000 and imprisonment for not less than 6 months nor more than 10 years. For the third and all subsequent convictions the bill provides a fine of not less than \$50 and imprisonment for not less than five years. Under the terms of this bill the violator will know that he will have to go to jail for the first offense. For a second offense he will know that he must go to prison for at least six months, and for the third offense he will have to serve at least five years, and he may be sent up for life if the jury and judge so decide. The only objection I have heard against such a bill is that the penalty is so severe that a jury may not convict, but you need not worry about the jury when the evidence warrants a conviction and is properly presented.

Mr. Chairman, the penalty should be severe. When the habitual violator of this law sees a life sentence staring him in the face he will think many times before he violates the law again. When we were campaigning in Oklahoma for the adoption of our State constitution in 1906, I was active for its adoption with a strong provision for prohibition. The constitution went into effect with statehood November 16, 1907. In all my campaigns I have advocated a stricter enforcement of our prohibition laws. In the Oklahoma City Times of October 5, 1928, is the following statement:

Violation of the Federal liquor law should be punishable with a six months' jail sentence for the first offense, five years for the second violation, and life imprisonment for the third offense, Congressman F. B. SWANK told an audience at Moore, Tuesday night.

The provisions of my bill provide these penalties.

We hear much talk and see numerous newspaper articles in the public press of this section and in other large cities about the laxity of the enforcement of the prohibition laws. For many years the Christian, law-abiding people of this country have been fighting gallantly to bring about sobriety in this Nation, and that work and the efforts of these good people have been well rewarded, for the country for all time is dry and rid of the open saloon that debauched the youth of our common land for so many years. We can not understand now just why the saloons and all their accompanying misery and evils were ever permitted in this country. No person can point to anything but evil that came from them.

In the old Indian Territory, where I lived to young manhood, there were no saloons. When I moved to Cleveland County, my present home, it was in the days of the open saloon. I well remember those days; and in our fight in Oklahoma for statehood I worked and fought with all my power and might for the cause of prohibition and have always been on that side of the question. I remember when local option was the slogan, but I opposed the saloon then as I do now. They were the curse of the Nation and caused more crime and poverty than all other causes combined. We lived through those conditions, but we do not want the same evil influences thrown in the paths of our

children and such temptations encountered by them. The light wine and beer advocates do not ask for the open saloon, but what they really want is heavy wine and high-powered beer with more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol. There is not going to be any legally manufactured wine and beer sold in the United States, for that would be the entering wedge for the open saloon; and the question of prohibition was settled when the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was adopted and the Volstead Act became a law. If there is any modification, it will be to tighten the law instead of weakening it.

The cry of those modificationists who want light wine and beer is personal liberty and lack of enforcement of the law. They do not complain of other laws that interfere with what they call personal liberty. Many laws on our statute books restrain citizens from the course some of them would pursue. When so-called personal liberty interferes with the rights of the masses of our people, it is then that the law steps in and tells them where to stop. So it is with prohibition. A drunk man becomes a nuisance on the streets, in the trains, and in other public places to the discomfort of other citizens. I remember in saloon days that ladies and children could not walk down some of the main streets to do their shopping on account of drunks and their insults. We see no such conditions now. In the city of Washington, during the past eight years that I have had the honor to be a Member of Congress and represent an honest, law-abiding, intelligent constituency, I have not seen a dozen drunk men in this city of some 600,000 people. The reason that I have not seen them on the streets was because they were not there. The antiprohibition talk that there are more drunk men now than before the enactment of the Volstead law is not correct. If there are more, why do we not see them in the Nation's Capital and in other large cities?

If we had the open saloon in this day the manufacture of automobiles would have to be greatly curtailed. They both could not go together. Drunk men are seldom seen in the section where I live. Thousands of young men and women have never seen a drunk person and, thank God, have never seen a saloon.

The law is here to stay since the enactment of our national prohibition laws, and we should now confine ourselves to a strict and vigorous enforcement. They will never be repealed nor weakened, and we must continue our efforts for real enforcement in the name of our children and for the good of our country. No law can be enforced 100 per cent, but the prohibition laws can be enforced like other laws. There are more people that believe in law enforcement than there are of the other kind. They want our prohibition laws enforced strictly. The law can be enforced better than it is now.

The eighteenth amendment was passed by Congress and submitted to the States December 18, 1917, and was adopted in 1919. The Volstead Act, giving force and effect to this amendment was passed by Congress in October, 1919, and became effective with the amendment January 17, 1920. Since the enactment of this law, attention should be called to the effect of the same. Let us examine the cold facts and figures as they speak for themselves. The following table shows the great increase in savings deposits, individual deposits, building and loan associations, and life insurance in the United States since 1921 to and including 1927:

Years	Savings deposits	Individual deposits	Building and loan association assets	Life insurance in force
1921.....	\$16, 500, 663, 000	\$34, 232, 612, 000	\$2, 890, 764, 621	\$45, 983, 400, 333
1926.....	24, 696, 192, 000	47, 472, 118, 000	6, 334, 103, 807	79, 644, 487, 109
1927.....	26, 090, 902, 000	49, 060, 021, 000	7, 000, 000, 000	87, 400, 000, 000

Some argue that it costs too much to enforce the prohibition laws and that much revenue could be derived by the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor. It costs something to enforce any law, but no one advocates the repeal of other laws on account of the cost of enforcement. When we figure what prohibition has saved the Nation, how it has helped and promoted our excellent system of public schools, and the happiness that it has brought to many a blighted home, the conclusion is that its enforcement is cheap. Mr. Chairman, the results of prohibition can not be valued in shining silver nor yellow gold.

After I retire from Congress March 4, 1929, I shall continue in the future, as in the past, to do everything within my power for upholding our prohibition laws and for their honest and strict enforcement. We are not going to take any backward step and I stand on that question where I have always stood, and that is for prohibition and strict sobriety, privately, personally, and publicly.

Below are some letters and resolutions received concerning our prohibition laws, thanking me for my attitude and work on that subject. I greatly prize and appreciate these letters and resolutions, for they come from people who believe in law enforcement and the betterment of our country:

FIRST METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
Oklahoma City, Okla., March 18, 1924.

Hon. F. B. SWANK.

HONORABLE SIR: We the undersigned wish to express our appreciation of your efforts in upholding the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, and pledge you our support in your efforts to prevent the legalizing of the sale of light wine and beer.

Respectfully,

THE LADIES OF THE FIRST METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH
OF OKLAHOMA CITY, A CHURCH NUMBERING 1,700 MEMBERS.

By Mrs. D. D. MCHENRY, *President*.
Mrs. A. C. PARSONS, *Secretary*.

NORMAN, OKLA., March 18, 1924.

Congressman F. B. SWANK:

I am writing you to protest against the attempt to license beer as made by the 60 Members of the House of Representatives who on March 4 introduced bills to so amend the Federal prohibition act as to legalize 2.75 per cent beer and to ask you to use your utmost effort against such a bill. You are there to represent us, the citizens of your district, and we know you well enough to believe you would do this even without a request. Nevertheless, as a Christian citizen and president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, I can't refrain from protesting against such a movement and to let you know we are with you in trying to retain the eighteenth amendment as it stands. We do not want the return of wine and beer.

Respectfully,

Mrs. A. H. HARLOW,
President Norman Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

OKLAHOMA WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
Oklahoma City, Okla., March 18, 1924.

Congressman F. B. SWANK,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SWANK: It is with gratifying rejoicing that I pen this communication to you because I do not have to protest against your attitude—we here know you are dry. But nevertheless we want to say there are thousands back of you in your district who protest against legalizing beer, and we want to cheer you with this dry-force knowledge. God speed the dry forces in our Government and give them victory in our prayer.

Very truly yours,

ALICE M. DAVID.

OKLAHOMA WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
OFFICE OF PRESIDENT.
Bartlesville, Okla., March 25, 1924.

Hon. F. B. SWANK,

United States Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Oklahoma Woman's Christian Temperance Union in executive meeting assembled in Bartlesville, Okla., this 25th day of March, 1924, beg to submit the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That we earnestly protest against any modification of the Volstead Act to legalize the sale of wine and beer, and that we urge the Senators and Representatives of our Commonwealth to use their best influence and vote toward the strengthening of the Volstead Act and the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

This resolution is the expression of a membership of 7,000 patriotic, loyal men and women of Oklahoma.

Thanking you for the prohibition victories which you have given us in the past and depending upon you for future victories, we are,
Yours sincerely,

ELIZABETH HOUSE,
Corresponding Secretary.
JOSEPHINE M. BUHL,
President.

THE MINISTERIAL ALLIANCE OF TULSA, OKLA.,
April 8, 1926.

Representative F. B. SWANK,

House of Representatives Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

My DEAR CONGRESSMAN SWANK: Inclosed find a copy of a resolution passed on last Monday, April 5, at a joint meeting of the white and colored ministerial alliances of the city of Tulsa at which time there were over 75 ministers of greater Tulsa in attendance.

We want you to know that your constituents greatly appreciate your splendid efforts in the past concerning the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act.

Very sincerely yours,

GUY C. TETIRICK,
Secretary Ministerial Alliance.

STILLWATER, OKLA., April 9, 1926.

Congressman F. B. SWANK,

Washington, D. C.:

Payne County is supporting you in your stand against the wets, and hope there will be no modification of the Volstead Act in their favor.

C. C. SUMAN, *County Attorney.*
L. W. WRIGHT, *County Assessor.*
M. E. BASIL, *County Treasurer.*
JOHN A. SHOW, *Court Clerk.*
CECIL G. JONES, *County Clerk.*
L. H. WOODYARD, *County Judge.*
J. B. CALDERHEAD, *Sheriff.*

EAST CENTRAL STATE TEACHERS' COLLEGE,
Ada, Okla., April 28, 1926.

Hon. F. B. SWANK,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SWANK: We take pleasure in informing you that the First Christian Church, of Ada, Okla., assembled for worship last Sunday and passed resolutions strongly indorsing your stand on the prohibition question as expressed in your telegram to the State convention of the Oklahoma church a few days ago.

We hereby congratulate you upon your stand and assure you of the cooperation of Christian churches everywhere in your efforts to keep this country free from the evil of intoxicating liquor.

Very respectfully,

A. C. CHANEY, *Chairman of Board.*
M. E. QUALLS, *Clerk of Board.*

ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT,
Oklahoma City, August 9, 1926.

Hon. F. B. SWANK,

Norman, Okla.

DEAR MR. SWANK: Congratulations! You never missed a cog.

Very cordially yours,

H. T. LAUGHBAUM, *Superintendent.*

NOVEMBER 4, 1926.

Hon. F. B. SWANK,

Norman, Okla.

DEAR MR. SWANK: Congratulations. You never slipped a cog. We had no fear of the results at any time.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Very cordially yours,

H. T. LAUGHBAUM, *Superintendent.*

THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
LEGAL DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1926.

Hon. F. B. SWANK, M. C.,

Norman, Okla.

DEAR MR. SWANK: Congratulations on your election. Your splendid public record is ample justification for the confidence which the people have in you.

It is heartening to the friends of the eighteenth amendment to know that for the eighth time under national prohibition the people have by overwhelming majorities in national primaries and elections sustained Senators and Congressmen who stand for the maintenance and enforcement of prohibition.

Anticipating the pleasure of seeing you at the Capital in the near future, I am,

Yours very cordially,

W. B. WHEELER,
General Counsel and Legislative Superintendent.

MARCH 11, 1927.

Hon. F. B. SWANK, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SWANK: At the close of the sixty-ninth session of Congress let me thank you again for your support of the legislation needed to enforce the eighteenth amendment. I am sure that the people of your district who believe in prohibition and its enforcement will approve of your record.

Yours cordially,

W. B. WHEELER.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I request this time in order to get something in the way of information relative to appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control—information respecting the surveys.

House Document No. 308 and the act of January 21, 1927, authorizes extensive surveys of streams throughout the United States for navigation, water power, and flood control. Then, in the flood control act under section 10, it adds and designates a number of important streams, and authorizes the surveys to be made simultaneously with the prosecution of the flood-control work, and requires that definite reports be made to Congress relative to investigations for flood control, and especially as to what effect upon flood control in the lower Mississippi Valley may be had by the institution of a reservoir system.

I would like to know from members of the committee if appropriations herein authorized supply the funds for those surveys provided for in the flood control act. Fifty million dollars is allotted for rivers and harbors. Is it understood that the department may use a portion of that \$50,000,000 to carry on the surveys authorized?

Mr. TABER. They are expected to, and they said that they would be.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I wanted to get that information because the people of the lower Mississippi Valley and especially in Louisiana and Arkansas are vitally interested in the reports to be made simultaneously with the prosecution of the flood-control program.

Mr. BARBOUR. General Jadwin said before the subcommittee that he would do that very thing, and that he would allot the amount necessary.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for the information. The citizens in the lower Mississippi Valley as well as those on these tributaries are vitally interested in a full, complete, and definite report as to what effect may be had on flood heights on the main stream by the institution of reservoir systems upon these tributary streams that contribute to the floods in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River.

During the hearings before the Committee on Flood Control and before the enactment of the flood control law of 1928, it was stated and shown by the reservoir board that reservoirs could be established on the Arkansas and White Rivers that would lower the flood heights at the mouth of the Arkansas River and opposite where the most disastrous crevasse occurred about 8 feet. Of course, that would not take care of the floods of two years ago, but in the floods of previous records it would have had an effect that would have made the valley entirely secure in that section, by the use of levees and bank revetment and without the necessity of flood ways.

So in the flood control law it is provided that these surveys shall be made simultaneously with the flood-control works on the main river and a report made to Congress as to what effect on the floods may be had by the installation of reservoir systems. Do I understand that out of the \$30,000,000 allotted to flood control a portion of that may be used as a part of the \$5,000,000 authorized in section 10 of the flood control act?

Mr. BARBOUR. It will be.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I will.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Flood Control. Is it his understanding that after these economic surveys are made that it was to be optional with the chief engineer as to whether or not the proper flood control would be instituted?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. At his discretion? No; it was not.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. It is the gentleman's understanding as a member of the committee that no matter what condition the engineers should find, they were directed to prepare a flood-control project for these rivers?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. And to make a report to Congress. Of course, in those reports that are made by the Corps of Engineers they very often, in fact usually, report upon the economic phases of the problem which they survey, and they make a report that something is unworthy of adoption because it is not "economically justified." That is the phrase usually used. I feel that these surveys should be made and all of the facts reported to Congress as to what the project is, whether it be a reservoir system or whether it relates to power or to navigation, and as to what the cost will be, and that as to

whether or not it is economically justified, in my humble opinion, should be left to the Congress.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. It is the gentleman's understanding that they were to report on physical flood-control projects in accordance with section 10 if they complied with that section.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes; I think so. I think they should report as to the flood control upon the rivers in the document, and those named in addition, such as the Yazoo, the Red, the St. Francis, and the White, and so forth. One reason why the people in these lower sections of the valley are anxious and determined, so far as they may have the power to do so, to secure definite reports under section 10 is that they feel that under section 1 of the flood control act, when the surveys were provided for the reach between Baton Rouge and Cape Girardeau, Mo., for a statement or report on means of flood control other than levees, that should have been considered; and they feel that that was practically ignored, and now, as full authority is given under section 10 to make that report, it should be made. I am glad to know from the members of the committee that the funds are provided and that we are entitled to get that report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it the gentleman's understanding that sufficient funds are provided in the pending bill to complete those surveys, or is it merely the amount the Chief of Engineers thinks he can use in the prosecution of that work during the next fiscal year?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. It is my understanding from the answers that out of the \$50,000,000 appropriated for rivers and harbors and the \$30,000,000 for flood control, the Chief of Engineers takes the position that he can allot whatever is necessary in order to complete those surveys, as required by the act of 1927 and the flood control act.

Mr. TABER. I would not want to be understood as saying that every one of those surveys would be completed in the fiscal year 1930. I would want to be understood as saying that the Chief of Engineers said that there was enough money in there so that he could go as far as his facilities would permit in completing those surveys and those estimates.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. And that he felt that he had authority to use the funds as they might be required and necessary for that purpose out of the \$50,000,000 and the \$30,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Oh, there is no question about that.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Anyway, it is made clear that there is full authority and a specific direction in section 10 of the flood control act for the survey and report authorized by section 1 of the same law wherein it was said that—

survey shall be made between Baton Rouge, La., and Cape Girardeau, Mo., * * * to ascertain and determine the best method of securing flood relief in addition to levees, of any flood-control works other than levees or revetments undertaken on that portion of the river.

If storage reservoirs on the Arkansas and White Rivers in territory adjacent to the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River can be installed that will lower flood heights, as shown by the report of the reservoir board made by Army engineers, to the extent of 8 feet at Arkansas City in Arkansas and 5 to 6 feet at the head of the Atchafalaya Basin in Louisiana, then this phase of the flood-control problem should have further consideration by the Congress.

The estimated cost would not be as great as the loss and destruction caused by one disastrous flood that might result by a failure to use the reservoir system.

So I am now appealing to the Corps of Engineers and to the Mississippi River Commission to make this complete survey and to give Congress a full and definite report.

This will in no way interfere with the prosecution of the work of flood control now in progress. The levee heights may be raised on the main stream, the bank revetment can proceed, and the construction of the Bonnet Carre Spillway above New Orleans will in no way be affected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, we resume our duties to-day for the new year, and I want first to wish all of the Members of the House a very pleasant, happy, and prosperous New Year. I am hoping that the Members of this House in taking stock of the legislative program for 1929 will endeavor to solve the problem that has been before Congress for the past four or five years, viz, farm relief. The pending bill carries approximately \$400,000,000 for

the support of the Army and it is necessary to have an Army as it is necessary to have a Navy, but it does seem to me as though we are always very liberal with the Army and with the Navy, and very economical when it comes to legislating or making appropriations for the farmers of the country. Days like this are days when we should take stock of the situation in the country generally. We pick up our newspapers in the morning and we see where the stocks in the stock exchange have gone sky-high, where fortunes have been made overnight on these stock exchanges throughout the country. I sometimes wonder whether or not these sums at which the stocks are sold represent the true value of the stocks. Then I look around and see what happens to people generally. Justice is supposed to be blind but she is evidently just blind in one eye. If a bunch of young fellows are caught playing poker or a few negroes caught shooting dice they are haled into court and fined. Yet the great stock gamblers of the country can gamble to their heart's content on the stock exchanges, and not only citizens of mature age indulge in this sort of gambling, but it is spreading out and they are bringing in the high-school boys and girls and inducing them to gamble on stocks. Justice in this country is illustrated by what has happened in our Capital City. A man charged with defrauding his Government out of millions of dollars is acquitted and crowds of wealthy friends meet him at the courthouse to congratulate him on his success. A poor negro woman steals five newspapers and is fined \$10 in the courts. The grand jury in session to investigate violations of the liquor law are surprised, if not chagrined, one morning, to find that two of its members had been caught in a neighboring State transporting liquor, and this while serving on this grand jury.

Some very peculiar things happened during the last campaign, and it is painful to me to recall that period. I do not care to make any reference to the issues in that campaign, except to say that I am a little disappointed that our friend Mr. Durant did not offer his reward for the best method of enforcing the prohibition question before the campaign ended. He waited until after the campaign was over before he offered any prizes. I see now that Mr. Hearst is offering a big prize to some one who will tell us the best method of repealing the eighteenth amendment.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Does the gentleman think that the recent Democratic candidate, the Governor of New York, Mr. Smith, would qualify for that prize if he submitted the plan he submitted in the wet territory during the campaign?

Mr. McKEOWN. There is a peculiar thing about that election. The wet fellows all say that Smith was defeated for some other reason than the liquor question, and I am sometimes inclined to think so myself, but I have wondered how these fellows would feel about this—if we were to make it a felony to sell whisky in the United States and a felony to buy whisky in the United States, and then let the fellow make his own whisky at home and not give it away. If he was too lazy to make his whisky, he would simply have to do without. I wonder how that would strike both sides of the controversy?

Anyway, what I rose to talk about is this question of farm relief. [Laughter.] I do not want to get away from that subject. I do not know what we are going to do about it, except I may say, speaking for myself, I am going to vote for the best bill at the first opportunity that I get a chance to, whether it is at this session or at a called session. I do not know of any good reason why it should not be passed now at this session instead of at another session. There is a difference of opinion, of course, about that. Some people think if we pass it now we shall not get as much if we would if we waited and passed it at the special session. My idea is to get what we can now and take as much the next time as you can get. The McNary-Haugen bill having been twice vetoed, some people do not believe that it would be the best thing to put that bill through now, but we have all come to the conclusion, I take it, that we are going to abandon the equalization-fee idea.

I have never been very strong for the idea of selling our products in Europe and other foreign countries for less money than we are selling them to our American people. And this applies to the sale of farm products or manufactured products.

One man said to me, "You voted for the equalization fee." I said, "Yes; that was the only thing we had a chance to vote for." I have an idea that if we should set up this board as proposed, and make an appropriation equal to the amount carried in this pending bill, some \$400,000,000, the board, when the Department of Agriculture should make its estimate upon any nonperishable crop, wheat, for instance, say in May, and estimated that we are going to make 750,000,000 bushels of wheat in the United States, which is just 100,000,000 bushels more than

we are going to consume in the United States, then the board would go out and take that 100,000,000 bushels of wheat off the market out of the first products coming on the market, and with that 100,000,000 bushels removed, you would have nothing to do but to leave the 650,000,000 bushels of wheat take its course in the markets.

If the estimate of the Agricultural Department should be in error and the wheat crop as developed further north in the wheat country would show that we did not have any surplus at all, but had only 650,000,000 bushels, then let the board withdraw this 100,000,000 bushels at a reasonable price to the consumer. That would take care of the situation both for the producer and the consumer.

I am not in favor of making the prices for the farmers so high as to make them prohibitive to the consumer. If the Department of Agriculture should estimate 16,000,000 bales of cotton and the board should decide that we needed for domestic consumption only 14,000,000 bales to supply the demand, then we would take off those 2,000,000 bales surplus, and the balance would take its regular course. In the event the estimate is correct, and there is a surplus left, then it would be the duty of the board before the seeding time for the next crop to notify the producers that we have already a surplus, and that if the producers produce a great surplus and increase their acreage they will have no relief, but must carry some responsibility in this matter.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. Does the gentleman think the grain gamblers and speculators in the United States will permit such a bill as that to become a law?

Mr. McKEOWN. Of course, I do not speak for them and I expect to have some opposition from them. The intention is not that we shall put anybody out of legitimate business, because we leave the bulk of the crop to be handled in the customary way. We are not trying to put anybody out of business. We are simply moving the surplus off the market.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Usually we have an exportable surplus of 200,000,000 bushels of wheat, estimating an average year. Assuming that, how would the Government, or this board, as you call it, handle this surplus?

Mr. McKEOWN. I would take the surplus off, as I said at the outset.

Mr. BURTNESS. I understand that.

Mr. McKEOWN. And then if there is a market abroad that would pay us for the wheat, why should we undergo any loss? We will have time and opportunity to hold it. I am opposed to the proposition of taking our wheat and selling it to the American consumer at one price and then dumping it into Europe at a lower price.

Mr. BURTNESS. So that if this board could not get a price abroad sufficient to cover the price they have paid for it, together with the cost of transporting it abroad and paying storage charges, would you keep the grain until the next season?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; I would keep it until the next season.

Mr. BURTNESS. And you would have the board announce to the wheat growers that we are holding over 200,000,000 bushels of wheat now, and that therefore the wheat farmers should reduce their acreage?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; because if they do not reduce their acreage how can the Government take care of them? They have to do something for themselves as well as have the Government do something.

Mr. BURTNESS. This would be of tremendous value for the first season, but after the first season it could not possibly be of any value unless the production was within the consumption.

Mr. McKEOWN. Well, it would if they did not make too much surplus; but let me tell the gentleman what is the matter: The trouble now is that under the present system we give the American farmer the markets of foreign countries as a standard, whereas I propose to give the American farmer the American market as a standard. What I am trying to do is to give the American farmer the American market as a standard for his crops instead of taking the foreign markets as a standard for the American farmer's products.

Mr. BURTNESS. I think that is what many of us have tried to do. What I was interested in ascertaining and why I asked the question was to find out your plan for taking care of the surplus wheat above domestic requirements.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am just telling the gentleman you can not govern the production of wheat in this country—and the gentleman knows that—unless you can reduce the acreage; and what I want to impress upon the farmers of this country is this fact, that if the Government is willing to put money into

the proposition of helping hold down the surplus and give them a fair price and give them the benefit of the American market, then they ought to be willing to do something on their part in helping hold it down and keep within the American market standard. You can take 160 acres of wheat, and if you have a big crop and there is a big crop all over the whole country, you will get less money on your good crop than you receive when you make a short wheat crop. But that ought not to be so, and that is not according to the law of economics. What you want, of course, is to make a lot of wheat, but what your farmers should learn to do is to intensify cultivation and make more wheat on less acreage rather than to try to crash the whole market. Let me show what the tendency of agriculture is in this country now. We do not have a proper balanced agriculture for this reason: Cotton is so unprofitable that the men in my country who raise cotton are doing something else. What are they doing just as fast as they can? They are going into the dairying business, which will eventually interfere with the dairying business up in the Northwest.

The first thing you know you will have the dairying business all out of balance and overdone. You will have the cotton business a little short and the dairying business long. Then up in the wheat country you will learn some other crop by which you will diversify so that you will augment some other product, which will result in keeping down the whole thing. The truth about it is that one-crop production in the United States has been destructive to every part of the country that follows the one-crop production.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, if the gentleman could control the amount of production he would solve the whole problem, but after the first year what method would the gentleman employ to curtail the following year's crop?

Mr. McKEOWN. I have had a method here but Congress will never pass it. My method is simply to go out and fix the amount of acreage according to what a farmer has had heretofore. I would fix that as the standard, as the standard of production.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. By law?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes. But Congress will not do that. They will not agree to that because they are afraid of the reaction, but the farmers of the country really want it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I believe the gentleman is one of the most aggressive and intelligent farm-relief fighters in this House and I have a suggestion to make to him. As the gentleman knows, in the big cities the neighborhood store is rapidly going out of business and we are having in its place these great chain stores, and we are beginning to find out that they are short-weighting the people on food products, and I think that if the farm people would take this up with the Secretary of Agriculture and look into this situation they might be able to sell more to the consumers by giving them proper weight.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am glad to have that suggestion from the gentleman.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am very much interested in the gentleman's suggestion but I want to ask his consideration of this phase of it: He said he would retire the first 100,000,000 bushels, provided there were 100,000,000 bushels, from production.

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. I wonder if the gentleman has given any consideration to the geographical effect of this?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes. It comes off the south end of it, and that helps you folks up in the North, because by the time it gets up to Michigan it may have gone up tremendously. The fellows in the South would receive a fair and reasonable price and there would be nothing in Michigan to complain about.

Mr. KETCHAM. Exactly, but I am wondering if that proposition would meet with the favor of the good people of Oklahoma?

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not know.

Mr. KETCHAM. I wanted to bring the matter to the gentleman's attention so as to be sure he had given it consideration.

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; I have given the matter consideration.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I want to say in answer to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New York, that the plan which the gentleman has suggested from the Oklahoma standpoint would save the consumer's money and save the farmer's money for this reason. Oklahoma is the

second winter-wheat State in the Union and when our wheat is harvested, all of it, under existing conditions, must go into the box cars, pay the freight to the primary point, go into storage, pass through two or three brokers' hands and within four months the Oklahoma mills are shipping wheat in there to grind, paying this extra freight both ways, paying these brokerages and charging them to the gentleman's consumers.

Should the Government take that surplus off of the market at the time, it would secure for the Oklahoma farmers a reasonable price for their wheat, save the consumers these brokerage and freight rates; and I would go further than the gentleman, and I would not permit this wheat to be sold out of storage to anybody but a miller who is going to grind it. This would benefit both the farmer and the consumer.

Mr. McKEOWN. Gentlemen, this proposition of taking off the first crop will mean that it will be taken off of the southern end of the production. Of course, in respect of cotton, we would go down to our friend GARNER's district in Texas and take his cotton first. Of course, if we did not give his people enough we would have a row with him about that, but we would go ahead and take the cotton down there first.

Now, what does this plan do? It does not interfere with the marketing arrangements of this country. It does not interfere with the business men of this country. It simply insures a fair price to the man who produces cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman give me a few minutes more? I would like to have about 15 minutes more and then I will not take much more of the time of the committee this session.

Mr. COLLINS. I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Now, this idea has simply occurred to me as being a solution of this question without all these entangling questions that have arisen and without involving the machinery of government. It does not put the Government in business except to take off this amount of production and store the product. It can do this through the cooperative organizations or do it directly.

We are saying that we are going to postpone our consideration of this matter until we take up tariff legislation, so we can help the farmer with the tariff. This is a very interesting thing to me.

There have been some interesting things developed about the tariff situation since the last campaign. As a former statesman from Georgia once said, some of us do not just exactly know "where we are at" on this question; but, anyway, the farmers are anxious to have their legislation and I doubt if the manufacturers are so anxious to have their tariff legislation just now in a few months.

I do not believe the masses of the manufacturers of this country are in any hurry about a tariff revision in this country. I am just taking that view by looking at it from the standpoint of a man who is in the great consuming class. Of course, if I were in the manufacturing class, I might have another idea; but, looking at it from the standpoint of a consumer, I am just wondering what the general run of the great manufacturers of this country have got to expect from a tariff revision.

You know that the business man when he sells an article figures that he is selling it for all it will carry, but some of these tariff rates are carrying all the products will bear and a little bit more.

The man who has that protection now does not want the tariff taken up for the next four years.

The truth of the business is: The tariff is an economic question and we all know it, but we have never been able to keep it out of politics. We get it into politics and the Republicans have always taken the tariff and knocked us clear into the middle of next month because they always get their campaign money out of the tariff proponents. [Laughter and applause.]

The tariff question is an economic one and we all know it. The Tariff Commission ought to be a fact-finding body empowered to make its recommendations to the Congress. There ought not to be a revision of the tariff except every 10 years upon the taking of a census of this country. There should be separate bills allowed and the rules of the House ought to be changed so that when you go to change one rate you can not be flooded with a number of other fellows wanting changes. If there is a meritorious change in the tariff schedule necessary, we ought to be permitted to make it without being hampered with 10 or 15 other amendments piled on to what is meritorious and thus destroy the meritorious proposition.

I am not a free trader. I have never been a free trader. I believe in a sufficient tariff to protect the manufacturers of this country and to protect the wage earner in his wages and

in his standards of living as against the poorly paid laborers of other countries. But I will tell you what I am not in favor of. I am not in favor of a tariff so high that when we give the manufacturers of this country the best market in the world—the American market—then permit him to go into the foreign country and compete with the same labor in the foreign market that we are protecting him against in this country. That is my position about that.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The gentleman will remember that in the recent campaign the Republican candidate for Vice President came to Oklahoma and promised the independent oil producers a tariff on crude oil. Has the gentleman any hope that either the party or the Vice President elect will carry that out for the benefit of the farmers and the independent oil producers of Oklahoma who are suffering by reason of 250,000 to 300,000 barrels of crude oil coming into this highly protective-tariff country free of charge?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to my friend that he has the happy faculty of bringing up rather particular situations when a man is talking generally. [Laughter.] I will say that they evidently believed the Vice President elect because they voted that way down there. [Laughter.] I do not know whether they are going to get it or not, but they evidently thought so, because all the ballot boxes where the oil fellows voted showed that they voted pretty straight along a certain line.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Is the gentleman willing to demand that he make good his promise to the Oklahoma producers?

Mr. McKEOWN. Oh, I quit demanding a long time ago. I came to Congress demanding things. [Laughter.] I started in here by "demanding" and I found out that you did not get anywhere by demanding things when it came to talking with Congressmen, because they wanted facts and not demands. [Laughter.]

The situation as I see it is this: If we are to have tariff legislation we should confine it to the needs for revision. There are a few schedules I would like to see revised downward, but everybody has an idea that tariff revision means to revise it upward. I do not believe that the great mass of the business men of this country want the tariff tinkered with now. They are getting along pretty well, from all reports, except the textile people up in Massachusetts, and what is the matter with the textile people there is this, that they should have gone years ago down in the South and bought the land and grown their own cotton, just as the tire fellows are going to do with the rubber.

I see that some fellow advocates chain farms—putting everybody on a chain farm. I have a few that I would like to have them put into the chain; perhaps they could make something out of them. I do not make much myself.

My idea is this, and I am serious when I say it, that we should go to work and give the farmers legislation to take care of the 1929 crop. What are you going to say when you go back home? That you wanted to give Mr. Hoover a chance to pass upon the legislation. Well, Mr. Hoover has said that he was going to carry out Mr. Coolidge's policy. At any rate that was the slogan. If you do not want Mr. Coolidge to name the board, you can very easily arrange it by saying that the board herein named shall not be appointed less than 60 nor more than 90 days after the approval of the bill.

Agriculture is on the decline. Whether this country is going to be better off by reason of moving the agricultural population to the big centers I do not know. I see that Mr. Ford is hiring additional men out in Michigan—30,000 of them in Detroit—and he confines his employment to the citizens of Detroit. That is all right. If we had enough Mr. Fords throughout the country, we would not need legislation for the unemployed.

Gentlemen, let me urge you to give some attention now to farm relief. You are going ahead with the appropriation bills, but give some attention to settling this agricultural question. If you are going to have tariff legislation, all right, have it, but let us get farm relief out of the way first. The manufacturers are not in a hurry for tariff revision. They are well taken care of now. There may be here and there a schedule that wants to be improved. Some of you know that when you start in others are coming in and want to have a schedule or two raised. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORTON D. HULL].

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rise to call your attention to an episode that took place last spring, and to address some questions to the

Committee on Military Affairs. I refer to the episode, a disturbing episode, that took place in an exchange between the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW], in which it appeared that an employee of the War Department, the Intelligence Department of the Army, one Harold Weeks, had made an affidavit that he had received certain documents which were nonfrankable, under the frank of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC]. In that incident it also appeared that the question was referred to the Postmaster General, and the Postmaster General found that there had been no violation of the franking privilege.

Now, it is a disturbing thing to me, that any employee of the Intelligence Department of the Army should be guilty of apparently framing up a case against a Member of the House or anybody appearing before any committee in the House. My questions addressed to the members of the Military Committee are these: Have they followed up the incident? Is this man Weeks still in the service of the Government? Did he act under the authority of any superior in what he was doing? Did he report to any superior what he had done, and how was it that this affidavit was referred to a Member of Congress and, apparently, not to the department, so far as we know? I think it is an outrage on the public if any employee of the Government can indulge in that sort of practice—in framing up affidavits on people properly before legislative committees of this Congress—and I think it is a matter which the Committee on Military Affairs should follow up.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The fact that this man Weeks is a sergeant in the intelligence office would indicate that he acted in pursuance of his military duty and not as a private individual. In any event, if he acted in the course of his duty, then, of course, some responsible superior officer must answer; and if he acted in his individual capacity, then something should be done in the way of disciplining him for the action that he took.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. The gentleman from New York agrees with my suggestion?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Fully.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURTNESS].

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I had not intended to say anything this afternoon, and the occasion for my arising will have to be laid at the door of my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN], who has given us a very interesting little talk upon farm legislation.

The especial thought that I want to bring to your attention is that I can not, for the life of me, see why this Congress should delay the passage of farm legislation until the next Congress meets, whether the next Congress meets in special session or in regular session. I believe there is no one who has tried to support and did support the so-called McNary-Haugen bill more sincerely than I. I believed in it thoroughly, but I realize that legislation along the lines of the McNary-Haugen bill, including the equalization fee, can not be enacted into law without at least first trying out another proposed remedy, and the remedy which I feel the majority of the country wants tried out by way of experiment and in the hope that it will solve the agricultural problem is that outlined in the speeches made by Mr. Hoover during the campaign and along the lines, generally speaking, of the Republican platform. With that in mind, it does not seem to me that the question as to just what precise form the legislation shall take is such a complex one.

Most intelligent people who have read anything about the subject know at least the general set-up that would be required by way of machinery. The task of drawing the legislation embodying the Hoover ideas would not be particularly difficult.

I was very much interested in the remarks made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] to the effect that some agency ought to be able to step in at the beginning of a marketing season—for instance, in the case of such a crop as wheat—and buy up what is termed the "exportable surplus" in the country of such a commodity. It is plain that under the suggestions made by Mr. Hoover the stabilization corporations to which he referred from time to time, which should be helped by the Government, could very well be used by the Farm Board for that very purpose, if the board decides that it would be good policy to do so. This was one of the very purposes outlined. I am entirely willing to follow and thoroughly agree with Mr. McKEOWN to that extent, but I can not follow him when he makes the next suggestion and says that when this exportable surplus is bought up it should be kept in the elevators and not be sold unless it can be used here at home in our domestic con-

sumption, or sold abroad for at least the amount of the purchase price, plus the transportation charges of getting it abroad. That procedure would aggravate the situation. Such surplus must be disposed of each season. It would be a mighty fine thing if somebody could control the actual production on the farms of our country, but that is impossible, and we might as well recognize that it is impossible. The difficulty with his suggestion is that if you have a surplus of 150,000,000 bushels or 200,000,000 bushels of wheat the first year, then, in order for his scheme to work at all, the following season we would have to reduce our entire production not simply down to the consumption needs, but down to the consumption limits less the carry-over surplus, and that would mean that under the figures he suggested we would reduce wheat production down to four or five hundred million bushels, almost down to half the usual crop. Then, in the very next breath our good friend from Oklahoma made the suggestion that they are having difficulties with cotton in his territory, and that the cotton farmers in his country, engaged in an unprofitable business, are switching to dairying, and that soon the dairying business will be overworked, and so forth. Of course, that is the situation, and it is one of the serious evils, and just as soon as a farm board or any other governmental agency would begin to tell the wheat farmers that they must cut their acreage in two, they would naturally switch to these other crops or products, and we would have falling down upon you the very evils to which the gentleman from Oklahoma refers. In our territory they would probably switch to dairying principally and to other lines of the farming industry, such as raising hogs, and if you carry his system out it would just be a case of jumping from the frying pan into the fire. Switching annually from one form of farming to another under Government mandate would not be a solution.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Did the gentleman examine the records to see how often we have had short crops of wheat?

Mr. BURTNESS. Oh, yes. We have never had a short crop of wheat in so far as not more than meeting the consumption needs in the United States is concerned. We have had a short crop of wheat in the sense that our yields have been low and our exportable surplus less, but not in the sense of not meeting the consumption needs of our own country.

Mr. McKEOWN. Is not the same thing true of wheat that is of cotton, that short crops come in just about often enough to offset this surplus?

Mr. BURTNESS. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. McKEOWN. What becomes of all these surpluses?

Mr. BURTNESS. They are sold abroad. They are sold in the case of wheat in exports of flour and of wheat itself, to the extent, on an average, of practically 200,000,000 bushels a year for the last 12 years. These are round figures given from memory, but fairly represent the general picture.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Is it true or is it not true that in a 5-year period there is no surplus of wheat?

Mr. BURTNESS. Before answering the question I shall ask the gentleman to define what he means by the word "surplus."

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. It is generally suggested in all of these arguments that there is no surplus of any of these commodities in a 5-year straight period. That is, the lean years take care of the fat years. Is that true or not true?

Mr. BURTNESS. I have found that there is a good deal of difference in the application or use of the word "surplus." The people who have made the statement to which the gentleman refers are those who take the position that an exportable surplus—that is, the production above what we consume in the United States—is not really a surplus, because it is really sold to some one and used, in fact needed, for food somewhere in the world. If that is the sense in which the gentleman uses the word "surplus," then, of course, the answer would be entirely different from what my answer would be to the question as to whether we have an exportable surplus, a surplus above the needs of the people of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. When the gentleman speaks of surplus, does he mean that we raise just a surplus of wheat over what we consume in the United States or a surplus of wheat over what we sell, no matter whether it is exported or not?

Mr. BURTNESS. I have not used the word "surplus" here this afternoon standing by itself. If the gentleman has followed my remarks he will have noted that I have always spoken of an "exportable surplus," meaning simply the production in excess of our own consumption needs. I believe those

words are definite and used in accordance with the understanding thereof in this House.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I am not trying to dispute the gentleman's statement. I am trying to find out something for the benefit of the Members of the House and myself, whether there is a surplus of wheat.

Mr. BURTNESS. On the average there is a surplus above consumption needs of 200,000,000, whether you take the average for the last 5 years or 10 years. That amount has had to be exported and sold abroad, either in the form of wheat unground or in the form of American wheat converted into flour. Sometimes it is over 200,000,000, and sometimes less, but always a surplus.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Unfortunately under our system of marketing the American wheat sold outside of our boundaries sets our price at home and bears down the price here at home, so that it does not bring in a fair return to our producers?

Mr. BURTNESS. That is unfortunately the case, the price abroad is the principal factor, but I would not say the sole factor in determining our price.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Certainly.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think that after all the debate we have had in this Congress on the question of farm relief and the various bills pending before the Congress we have sufficient knowledge of the subject, so that Congress is just as competent now to pass a satisfactory bill as a new Congress would be?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes. That is my attitude precisely. There is also no great changes to take place in the next Congress. The same general organization will be in control and the membership not much different.

I wanted to ask my friend from Oklahoma, Mr. McKEOWN, during his remarks the question as to when wheat starts moving in Oklahoma. I did not have opportunity to ask him before his time expired, but if I had asked him that question he would probably have told me that it starts to move about the middle of June. Is that correct? I will ask the gentleman from Oklahoma now.

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; about the 15th of June.

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes. In the State of Kansas, too, it starts moving in June, in some parts, and in the rest of Kansas it starts moving in July. I may say that new wheat moves into the markets from June clear to the end of the threshing season throughout the wheat territory, and threshing operations continue up in northwestern Canada through October and even into November some years. Most of the spring-wheat threshing in the Northwest is done in August and September.

Now, what is the situation if we postpone farm-relief legislation until the next Congress? Oh, some people say that a bill can be passed in four weeks' time or so. Most of us know that unless farm-relief legislation is passed before the 4th of March we will not see it written on the statute books until next June or July. One of the most important functions of the Chief Executive after enactment of the legislation will be to select the farm board. It should not be selected in a hurry. The best thought and consideration must be given to the selection of that board. Then, after its appointment and qualification, you know how long it takes for a board to organize or for any establishment having to do with the Federal Government to get going with the great amount of red tape involved. In this particular matter much more than mere red tape will be involved, because the board will have to analyze the entire crop and marketing situation and determine upon the policies to be carried out during that particular crop season. In my judgment the postponement of farm legislation until the next Congress means practically that you might as well not attempt to pass any farm-relief legislation until after the producing season of 1929.

I know that when I make this statement I differ in my views from those entertained by most of the representation from the general Northwest, for I understand the sentiment of many Members of Congress from the Northwest is that we ought to wait until the next Congress.

I know, too, that the leaders of many of the farm organizations have assumed that same position. But when they have done so, I can not believe that they have had a full understanding of the slow methods involved in passing legislation and the unlooked-for delays always encountered, and they do not realize the length of time required by such a board to organize and agree upon its policies as to the next season's crop. I feel they have jumped at conclusions rather than

thought the matter through, especially in so far as its effect upon the 1929 crops is concerned.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Has the gentleman any idea how large the loss will be to the 1929 crop if we do not take care of it?

Mr. BURTNESS. I do not know just what this proposed legislation will add to the price of wheat or any other commodity, but let us assume that it will add only 10 cents a bushel for illustration. Under a normal crop in 1929 the loss of the season would mean a loss of \$80,000,000 on that crop alone under a conservative estimate. Other illustrations, doubtless, come to the minds of all of you.

I was interested in the suggestion made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] with reference to the appointment of the board. Our people generally believe that the man who should be as directly responsible as possible for the success of the board that is going to be appointed under farm-relief legislation, if enacted, is the man who becomes Chief Executive of the United States after March 4—Mr. Hoover. They desire that he appoint the board, but I do not think that the fact that he should be responsible for the work of the board and that he should appoint it is any reason for our delaying the enactment of farm-relief legislation until the next Congress. I, for one, do not believe that President Coolidge would appoint the board, even if the legislation is passed a few days prior to March 4. President Coolidge knows and realizes as well as any of us that the campaign was made by Mr. Hoover on the specific promise of himself and his party that the question of farm legislation is one that must be solved, and in that campaign Mr. Hoover pledged his best efforts to the solving of that problem. Naturally President Coolidge would under such circumstances hesitate to appoint a board which could not possibly go to work until after the beginning of the Hoover administration. I firmly believe he would leave the selections to his successor, with whom he has always cooperated and whom he honored not only by his support in the campaign but by appointment to his own Cabinet.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes; certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. If the next administration has the responsibility of solving the farm problem, why not permit the next administration to have something to say about framing the law? The gentleman well knows that Mr. Hoover, if he were here in Washington, could not take up with Members of Congress or the Committee on Agriculture the question of farm relief.

Mr. BURTNESS. I do not just concede that. Mr. Hoover took up with the entire country during the campaign the question of farm relief legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. He did that as a candidate.

Mr. BURTNESS. And he made his views pretty well known. I believe the members of the Committee on Agriculture, capable men as they are, know very well what those views are, and I do not know that it would be particularly unseemly for one or two of their emissaries, if they thought they needed it, to ascertain them a little more in detail. Mr. Hoover has always dealt frankly with the public, and I do not believe representatives of the Agricultural Committee would find him particularly skittish about the problem, if they desire to consult him when he arrives in the continental United States. I agree that his views should be embodied in the legislation to be passed. But remember that there has not been any great issue or any great difference in views as to the type of legislation that would be signed by Mr. Hoover or by President Coolidge.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Hoover, in his campaign, outlined a definite and concrete program for agriculture.

Mr. BURTNESS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, and I agree with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. He was a candidate and the farmers of the country voted for him. They believed in him, and they believe in him now, and I think there is an almost universal sentiment among the farmers, at least of the Mississippi Valley, that this matter ought to go over until Mr. Hoover is in a position where he can, with propriety, discuss this matter with Members of the House and Senate responsible for the legislation.

Mr. BURTNESS. The gentleman may be entirely right as to the sentiment in that regard. If that sentiment does exist, all I can say is that I must differ with the conclusion reached. There is another proposition upon which I agree with the gentleman, namely, that throughout the campaign the proposition outlined by Mr. Hoover was "a definite and concrete program for agriculture," and knowing that fact that is the very reason why I say it would not be any task for the committee of which the gentleman is an able member to convert those ideas and that

program into a piece of workable legislation, and I want to go further than that. I want to say this: That in so far as the first piece of legislation is concerned, the exact form or nature of that legislation is not half as important as the selection of a proper kind of board to administer it, and I am convinced that the farmers of this country will be entirely satisfied with the kind of board Mr. Hoover will select to carry on the work when that time comes, even if we should pass the legislation at this session of Congress. The experience of the board will doubtless show needed changes in the legislation in any event and later we will need their advice. If we pass the first legislation before March 4 and Mr. Hoover appoints the board, say, before the 1st of April or the 15th of April, and the farmers find that the board can then go to work, organize, establish policies, and operate on this season's crop, they will be more than satisfied. On the other hand, if this Congress follows the advice and suggestion of those who contend that all these matters should be left to a special session and then the farmers find we will be working here for weeks and months, perhaps, before we can write the bill into law, and find that there must be still further delay in the appointment of the board and that the board can not agree upon its policies, or can not organize and get into operation until next September, October, or November, then I think the criticism on the part of the farmers will be directed not at those of us who feel that such legislation should be passed at the earliest possible moment but at those who throughout the last few weeks have been urging delay in the adoption of legislation on this very important subject. [Applause.]

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I have been one of those who favored delaying this, but, as a matter of fact, is it not true that Mr. Hoover as a candidate contemplated the passage of this legislation in the short session when he said he would call a special session if this session of Congress did not pass this law?

Mr. BURTNESS. There can not be any other construction, in my opinion.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. He not only contemplated that but he rather hoped that this session of Congress would pass it and the statement he made was to this effect: That if this session did not pass it then, and only then, would he call a special session of Congress.

Mr. BURTNESS. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman. I believe the gentleman from Iowa was also present at a conference with Mr. Hoover, in which quite a number of Members of this House participated, and at which Mr. Hoover also rather expressed the hope that this Congress would be able to take care of the agricultural problem in so far as passing the required legislation for general farm legislation was concerned.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. BURTNESS. I am glad your recollection of the instance conforms with my own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not a fact, recognized by every man informed as to conditions, that the only farm bill President Coolidge would sign is a bill which involves the formula contained in the Fess or Curtis bill, which the gentleman who is now addressing the House opposed and which the farm organizations in America have denounced as a counterfeit farm-relief measure?

Mr. BURTNESS. No; I do not say that that is correct. I do not think that is the only kind of bill President Coolidge would sign at all. On the other hand, I believe he would sign a measure in conformity with the views expressed by Mr. Hoover in his campaign speeches.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not true that the so-called McNary bill recently introduced in the Senate is the McNary-Haugen bill emasculated of the equalization fee, and is not that the same bill that the gentleman and practically every other representative of a great farming district in America have denounced as a counterfeit farm relief bill for the last three or four years?

Mr. BURTNESS. I do not want to answer the gentleman's question yes or no, but I will answer it fairly. Substantially, the present McNary bill is the old McNary-Haugen bill with the equalization-fee principle taken out of it.

I believe I have already made the statement that those of us who believe that this problem can only be solved eventually by legislation along the equalization-fee principle of the McNary-Haugen type must realize that the first experiment that will be conducted in farm legislation is along this other line without the equalization fee; and to those who believe in the

equalization fee I want to emphasize this statement. The quickest way in which to get equalization-fee legislation, if it should be found that nothing else works, is to pass the other legislation first and give it a fair trial. If upon a fair trial it is found not to do the business, then you and I and anyone else who entertains the view that this problem can best be solved through such legislation as the McNary-Haugen bill with an equalization fee will be able to come in with a stronger case than we have ever had before, and I believe if that time comes both the President and the American Congress will be willing to listen to the plea. But up until that time, let us be fair with the other proposal, let us not put any stone in its way, let us give it a chance to operate; and I think we will all hope, when the legislation is passed, that it will be able to do the business and solve the problems that are involved. [Applause.]

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes; but I want to reach another point.

Mr. LOZIER. The gentleman did not make that argument when these legislative proposals were pending in the Congress one, two, and three years ago, but the gentleman insisted that they were counterfeits and inefficient formulas and would not work. Now, I will ask the gentleman a question—

Mr. BURTNESS. I was here pleading for the kind of legislation which I thought was best, which I still think is best, and in the hope at that time we would be able to write it into law, but, apparently unlike the gentleman, I recognize a practical situation when I see it. I do not feel that I am blind. I know equalization-fee legislation can not be written into law before March 4. I know it can not be written into law in the next Congress, so let us not be dogs in the manger and stand in the way. Let us pass the very best kind of legislation we can possibly get at the earliest possible moment. [Applause.]

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not a fact that if the so-called McNary bill, which is the McNary-Haugen bill emasculated by the removal of the equalization fee, is a sound and workable formula now, was it not a sound and workable formula before the election when the gentleman was opposing it?

Mr. BURTNESS. The answer is so obvious that the question does not need any reply.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] made the same suggestion on the floor here this afternoon that I made in a statement which I gave out to one of the newspapers in the Northwest on December 3, the opening day of this session, namely, that if we want to insure by legislation the appointment of the board by the President elect rather than by the present President, we can very easily accomplish that by writing into the bill a provision that is not unusual in legislation, a provision that the law shall go into effect on some certain date, some such date as March 15 or April 1.

I have mentioned this to many Members of the House from time to time in conversations in the cloakroom and elsewhere, and a few have suggested that such a provision might seem like an affront to President Coolidge. I would not so regard it. As already indicated, it is a rather usual provision to put in legislation, but let me make this statement with respect thereto. It would be much less of an affront to write that provision into a bill than it will be for this Congress to sit idly by for three months and pay absolutely no attention whatsoever to the provisions he wrote into his message asking our earnest consideration for farm legislation and which was delivered to us at the opening of this session. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I realize that whenever a Democrat has the temerity to offer any suggestion in this confusion of counsel among our Republican brethren upon the farm question, he runs the danger of suffering the proverbial fate of the innocent bystander, but it would not be amiss possibly for a Democrat to kind of soliloquize aloud as to the situation.

I find myself somewhat surprised. I do not know whether it is a sign I am no longer a boy, but somehow I have reached that point where I like to look back a little bit and think about what has been, and when I look back just a few months I can remember how every mother's son of you Republicans was clinging onto Calvin Coolidge's coat tail, and even Herbert Hoover was saying, "If you will just elect me President of the United States, I will carry out Coolidge's policies." And lo and behold, Mr. Chairman, how the times have changed.

We find gentlemen upon the Republican side to-day who say they can not trust Calvin Coolidge to appoint a farm board. No; you will not trust him. You say he is not the friend of the farmer. You insist that you must wait until the new leader comes in and so do the farm-leader politicians and then we will

let him come and tell us what kind of bill he wants and let him appoint his board and let him do the work.

There may be a streak of contrariness in my make-up, Mr. Chairman, but somehow I find myself always with the under dog, or with the fellow who is slipping, and now as Cal goes out, his appointing power being about exhausted, I find myself resenting these imputations of some of my Republican friends that they can not trust Cal to be the friend of the farmer. You have stood by him until the last piece of pie has been distributed, and now you desert him. I protest against this wanton abandonment of the leader you followed in the heyday of his power and pie.

Why, have you not told us for years that he was a real friend of the farmer; haven't you promised to carry out his policies in the platform utterances, and your speeches on the stump? Why must the farmer wait; why will you keep your promise to his ear and break it to his hope?

Mr. Hoover is coming to town. Go down and ask him what his plan is. Then, when you have got it, have the Agricultural Committee bring it out and pass it, and let the farmer have the relief you have promised for eight years. Why defer it any longer? [Applause.]

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADKINS].

Mr. ADKINS. Mr. Chairman and gentleman, it would seem that the farm problem has been so much discussed that the subject ought to be exhausted.

I have been greatly interested and amused at some of our newspapers and a great many men who have persistently and insistently opposed the program brought here by the farmers for farm relief at their undue haste and anxiety to pass farm relief now at the short session of Congress. That about all we have to do is to write the law on the statute books, touch the button, and away it goes.

First of all, there does not seem to be much of an issue now that there is a farm problem to solve. Everybody seems to agree that there is not much of an issue, that the surplus is the cause of the farmers' plight. Everybody admits that it is the surplus that causes the trouble. Everybody seems to admit also that it will be necessary to have a Federal farm board to administer the distribution of the surplus in times of necessity. Everybody seems to have agreed to that.

Everybody seems to agree that you can not start this without a large Federal loan. Up to that point there does not seem to be any material issue in the farm-relief problem.

There does seem to be an issue as to how the losses must be taken care of in the operation of the machinery to take care of the surplus.

Any man that has studied the agricultural conditions for the last 25 years knows that they have not been able to organize a corporation or a commodity association that is nation-wide that has been able to succeed against competitive business.

No people have yet been able to demonstrate over a period of years that so large a commodity organization can survive, especially if it encounters losses during the first year or two of its existence.

Denmark tried this out and failed. The Danish Farmers' Cooperative Potato Association organized a nation-wide marketing organization in 1919. You will find an account of this in Department Bulletin of the Department of Agriculture No. 1266 and issued in August of 1924. It says that contrary to the common Danish method, this new potato association set up the central machinery and then began to build the locals. With an enormous organization force and the advantages of a favorable foreign market demand, the association closed the first year's business with export sales amounting to \$8,283,000 at exchange, and its membership totaled 350 local associations with 25,000 producers. Enormous losses incurred in export trade, together with the market depression in 1920, wrecked the association in its second year's operation. Its failure is attributed to inefficient management and a mushroom-like growth during an inflation period.

In the same bulletin you will find on page 25 the experience of a nation-wide agency known as the Danish Cooperative Butter Export Association, organized in 1889. Approximately 90 per cent of the milk production in the country was assembled and manufactured into finished food products in the cooperative creameries. Yet this organization went along until 1908, when it was forced to discontinue, and they have since organized, according to this authority, 11 separate export associations.

Denmark with all her experience in cooperation was unable to make so large a nation-wide corporation survive, and in that little country where the volume of business would be nothing to compare with such an organization that would necessarily have to be created in this country to handle such a business.

In providing the means of stabilizing and getting on its feet the so-called stabilization corporation that seems to be recommended by all is the perplexing problem to be solved by the next administration. The present administration does not seem to have anything to offer on that all-important question.

Mr. Hoover's experience as food administrator handling the volume that was necessary for him to supervise and his ability and capacity to handle and solve big problems, I think appeals to the farmers in such a way that they perhaps have more confidence in him to work this problem out or to suggest some scheme to maintain this great corporation until our whole marketing machinery can be adjusted in such a way that the institution can stand on its own feet. Whatever program is worked out, if it survives a few years and is sound, it will be able to take care of itself. If some means is not provided to meet the contingencies previously referred to, I do not think the farmers would be interested in it; and I think they have confidence, for the reason already stated, that Mr. Hoover will have something at least very interesting to suggest to meet this situation.

Twenty-five years ago, when the local cooperatives started, if they had not provided an equalization fee, or what we called a "penalty clause" at that time, I do not think many of them could have met the competition they had to meet and survive. After a few years the necessity for such a fee had passed away.

I do not think there is any question but that the farmers in the great surplus-producing sections of our country and who would be most vitally affected by such legislation are not looking to this Congress to pass such legislation, but are looking to the incoming Congress to pass such legislation that will solve their problems.

Now I have read the two messages of the President, vetoing the McNary-Haugen bills, and the equalization fee was not the only thing he criticized. I have not compared the other bill but it is suggested that it is the McNary-Haugen bill with the equalization fee left out. What are you going to do with the other provisions that the President criticizes? The President in his messages has not pointed out a single thing that would cause this revolving fund to revolve, if he could put it in operation, or what inducements there would be for farmers to organize this stabilization corporation and borrow this money and take over for example the surplus of the coming wheat crop if it should be one hundred and fifty or two hundred million bushels. If there are no means provided to take care of a loss should it occur, and it very likely would, it is not likely that such a scheme would be seriously attempted if the corporation or the individual farmer was made in any way liable for the loan made to them, and if there was a large world supply of wheat and a falling world market there would no doubt be losses to be taken care of, either by the corporation or its stockholders, or taken care of by the Government. To be sure if there was a world shortage of wheat and a rising world market the surplus would be disposed of at a profit and everybody would be happy, but when the price is such that the farmer produces this at a loss and the stabilization corporation takes a hold of it, losses, it would seem to me, would be inevitable.

In the last campaign we made much of Mr. Hoover's great organizing ability and his ability to handle large problems. During his administration as food administrator he handled a very large business and he handled it in a way that I have not heard anybody criticize. People look to him to have something to suggest to take care of this proposition, to take care of the loans for the first few years at least, because no one who has had anything to do with cooperation for 25 years past believes that this corporation that you are providing for under the supervision of this board is going to be able to withstand the competition they will have to meet in this country and live unless some provision is made to take care of it the first few years of its life. Mr. Hoover, I think, in the campaign went as far as a man should go in making his statements about this program of our taking care of this. The farmers of the country who have been taking an interest in this matter know the present President has made no suggestion as to how these loans shall be taken care of during the first few years of the life of these stabilization corporations. They believe that Mr. Hoover will have something to suggest that will be of advantage to Congress as to how this stabilization fund is to be maintained.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADKINS. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Would it not be far better to set up the organization here and start it out, and then take advantage of Mr. Hoover's wide experience to see how it operates. Would he not know better where the weaknesses are in such a case so

that we might take care of them in the next session of Congress?

Mr. ADKINS. No; and I will tell you why. First of all, we have all talked as if this board is the whole show. Neither the President of the United States nor the incoming President believes that it is good policy to put the Government into business.

The talk has been as if this board is going to dispose of this surplus. This board is not going to do that. First of all, after this board has been provided for, you get ready to get your law into operation, you have got to get your cooperatives or your farmers or somebody to organize your stabilization corporations and get that ready to go into the business of taking over the surplus. For instance, if you are going to take care of the surplus wheat this coming crop, which you gentlemen all seem so exercised about, you do not wait for the board that is to be appointed by Mr. Hoover when he becomes President. I see that somebody gave out the statement that it would take six months for this to get going, but if Mr. Coolidge is to appoint the board, it will not be able to operate for this wheat crop if you pass the bill now.

You have this stabilization corporation to organize. We do not need to kid ourselves. The men who are most interested in this legislation are sold on the idea that the President of the United States is not particularly in sympathy with their scheme to raise the price of wheat, for instance, at the next harvest. A large per cent of them are also sold on the idea that a bill that would pass through this Congress and be permitted to become a law would not mean much to them. It is the psychology of the proposition that is bad. I don't know of a single cooperative organization in my part of the country that would even start to organize under this program. They would say, "I am not going to take hold of this if my company is made liable for this loan, or the farmers individually, we will not touch it." This is all an experiment. We do not know whether these beautiful theories that we have been outlining are going to work out in actual business practice. We have a marketing system that has been built up during almost a century of our economic development years, and it is the most efficient in the world. We get our commodities now from our fields to the processor, or the consumer, more cheaply than any other nation in the world.

You propose stepping in now in competition with that system which has been built up by the shrewdest minds in the world, and the theory that we have been touting here of stabilizing the violent up-and-down movements in the market giving the farmer the benefit of the domestic market plus the tariff, when put into actual operation may not work. I submit to the candid judgment of any man here whether in undertaking so gigantic an economic proposition we should not undertake it under the most favorable conditions possible for the psychological effect it will have on the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADKINS. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman recalls the fact that at one time here in this House we who were favoring this bill—

Mr. ADKINS. Oh, I wish the gentleman would ask a question and not make a speech.

Mr. McKEOWN. We were told not to offer an amendment or to vote for a single amendment on this bill as it came from the Senate in order to pass it in a hurry. Why has the gentleman changed so much about being in a hurry now to pass this legislation?

Mr. ADKINS. How is that, how is that?

Mr. McKEOWN. We had instructions from the leaders on this farm bill when it came from the Senate not to vote for a single amendment, not to change the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," in order that the bill might become a law, and we followed those instructions. Why not be in as great a hurry now as then?

Mr. ADKINS. Because it will not do the business.

Mr. McKEOWN. But the other bill would not do the business, either.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Does the gentleman take the stand that the initiative for such legislation must come from the Chief Executive, and that Congress must await the plan in detail of the incoming President?

Mr. ADKINS. No.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I have understood the gentleman to argue that way.

Mr. ADKINS. In the last campaign out in our part of the country this was the principal issue that we presented to the farm people. As I said a moment ago, we continually held up the picture of Mr. Hoover's great economic ability, his ability to solve these problems. We pointed out the fact that he never has tackled a big problem which he has not made a success of, and while this is a gigantic problem, yet we think from the experience that he has had with it that he has the initiative and ability to suggest something.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the gentleman suggests waiting for that?

Mr. ADKINS. Certainly. We have got to have the cooperation of the farmers, of the legislative body, and of the Executive to work out this program.

Now, nobody has suggested, as I said a while ago, how we are going to maintain this revolving fund. I take it that Mr. Hoover is going to have something very interesting to suggest along that line. He knows the experience of other countries in attacking a proposition of that kind. If they did not have some means of taking care of the losses, the outfit went out of business.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADKINS. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not true that this fund can only be kept intact by accretions from two sources, one from the commodity growers and the other by subsidies from the United States Treasury?

Mr. ADKINS. There are three ways in which the next wheat crop can be handled. The only way it would maintain itself would be for some world condition to arise in which we would have a rising world market. Then this stabilization corporation would feed this surplus on the market at a profit and everybody would be happy. It is only when the world's markets are likely to be low that they would, perhaps, be operating. Now, the losses incident to put this surplus on the world's market would be borne either by the stabilization corporation or the stockholders or the Government.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADKINS. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman know, or does he know of anyone who does know, what Mr. Hoover has in mind to recommend in respect to farm relief?

Mr. ADKINS. I will answer that by saying this: It was asserted during the campaign that Mr. Hoover said if the present Congress did not pass a law that he would call a special session. I do not think any fair-minded man would have expected him to have said anything else, and I do not think any man in this House would think that it would be proper even to suggest to the President elect to make a recommendation to this Congress on any subject. I do not think that a man who would be honest with him or with himself would think that that would be a proper thing to do. [Applause.]

Now, if this so-called equalization fee is unconstitutional and surplus control is to be put into operation to meet this situation, some other plan must be worked out. If Mr. Hoover has that plan it will be very interesting and very helpful to know what it is.

This idea of surplus control to be handled by the farmers themselves is a very difficult problem. The farm leaders and Congress have made two suggestions as to how it should be done, both of which have been rejected. Whatever we try will be an experiment, and I believe that experiment should be tried under the most favorable conditions possible—conditions that will inspire confidence in the farmers in making the trial and the cooperation between them and the administration in trying to solve this problem, not only in the interest of the producers but the consumers as well. It is thought by many that a plan of this kind will ultimately work out to the advantage of both. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15712) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. ALMON), for an indefinite period, on account of illness;

To Mr. ROMJUE, for the balance of the week, on account of the illness of his wife; and

To Mr. WINTER, until January 14, 1929.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 10093. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Young, alias James Williams.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an announcement. There are two resolutions on the calendar from the Committee on Rules, proposing changes in the rules of the House. One changes the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, referring all constitutional amendments to the Committee on the Judiciary; and another one is relative to a matter that has been discussed considerably on the floor of the House, that where a bill proposes an amendment to certain laws at least the part to be amended shall be printed together with the new text. We expect to call these up in the next few days. I thought I would notify the Members accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 4, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for January 4, 1929, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

(10 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

District of Columbia appropriation bill.

(11 a. m.)

First deficiency appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Favoring the ratification by the United States Senate of the Kellogg peace pact (H. Res. 264).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To hear private bills.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

Consenting that certain States may sue the United States, and providing for trial on the merits in any suit brought hereunder by a State to recover direct taxes alleged to have been illegally collected by the United States during the years 1866, 1867, and 1868, and vesting the right in each State to sue in its own name (H. J. Res. 166).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

711. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of the Gray Artesian Well Co. against the United States (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

712. A letter from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting report of claims arbitrated or settled by agreement from October 16, 1927, to October 15, 1928, by the United States Shipping Board and/or the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

713. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report on investigations made by the Department of Agriculture as to the feasibility of a 10-year cooperative program for the control of predatory animals within the United States (H. Doc. No. 496); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

714. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale of the old Syracuse post office and courthouse building and site; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

715. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of papers or documents now in the files of the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

716. A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting report showing 77,378 pounds of useless papers have been disposed of, and the proceeds, \$510.69; to the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

717. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to regulate the minimum-age limit for enlistments in the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

718. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report on the case of Annie E. Springer, widow of William Springer, who is included in Private Act No. 178, Seventieth Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

719. A letter from the vice chairman, national legislative committee of the American Legion, transmitting proceedings of the Tenth National Convention of the American Legion, held at San Antonio, Tex., October 8 to 11, 1928, inclusive; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed.

720. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1929, in the sum of \$5,000 (H. Doc. No. 497); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

721. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations pertaining to the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1929, in the sum of \$13,500 (H. Doc. No. 498); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

722. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal year 1929, in the sum of \$10,000 (H. Doc. No. 499); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BARBOUR: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 15712. A bill making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLTON: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 15088. A bill to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the Lafayette National Park in the State of Maine, and for change of name of said park to the Acadia National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14458. A bill authorizing the Rio Grande del Norte Investment Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near San Benito, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15005. A bill authorizing the Donna Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Donna, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2000). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15006. A bill authorizing the Los Indios Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Los Indios, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15069. A bill authorizing the Rio Grande City-Camargo Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15269. A bill to extend the times for commencing

and completing the construction of a bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2003). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15333. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the South Park commissioners, and the commissioners of Lincoln Park, separately or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across that portion of Lake Michigan lying opposite the entrance to Chicago River, Ill.; and granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Lincoln Park to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Michigan Canal, otherwise known as the Ogden Slip, in the city of Chicago, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2004). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15470. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Cumberland River in the vicinity of Harts Ferry, Trousdale County, Tenn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2005). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1468. A bill to correct the military record of John J. O'Connor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7887. A bill placing Cadet Adrien Van Leeuwen on the retired list; with amendment (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11869. A bill for the relief of William L. Bruhn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 14242. A bill for the relief of Everett A. Dougherty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 14378. A bill to authorize an appropriation to cover damages to an automobile of William H. Baldwin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 15561. A bill to correct the military record of Lawrence Fisher; with amendment (Rept. No. 1998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14601) granting a pension to Margaret C. Boyle; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14855) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Wilkinson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15165) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Brooks; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14578) granting a pension to Margaret Higgins; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 15712) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 15713) to establish uniform requirements affecting Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 15714) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ocmulgee River at or near Fitzgerald, Ga.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 15715) authorizing the construction of a high-level bridge across the Maumee River at

or near its mouth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 15716) to provide for the erection and operation of public bathhouse at Hot Springs, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 15717) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Stanton, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 15718) granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of the county of Lake, State of Indiana, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Grand Calumet River at or near Lake Street, in the city of Gary, county of Lake, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 15719) to restore Fort Negley, at Nashville, which was used and occupied by Federal forces during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15720) to remit the duty on a set of bells to be imported for the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 15721) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for the relief of certain homestead entrymen in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 15722) providing a nautical school at the port of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 15723) authorizing an appropriation of Crow tribal funds for payment of council and delegate expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15724) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 15725) for the acquisition of private lands within the exterior boundaries of the Niobrara Reservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15726) to increase the import duty on certain agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15727) to relinquish all rights, title, and interest of the United States in certain lands in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 15728) to amend the act of Congress of June 26, 1906, entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 15729) to amend the national prohibition act, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 15730) to amend the act of August 29, 1916, relating to the promotion of officers in the Navy, to provide for the promotion of officers who have been wounded in line of duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 15731) to amend "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close certain streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia rendered useless or unnecessary by reason of the opening, extension, widening, or straightening, in accordance with the highway plan of other streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 30, 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 15732) making an additional grant of lands for a miners' hospital for disabled miners of the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15733) to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society, United States Daughters of 1812, in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 15734) to authorize homestead entrymen and owners of patented lands to purchase not exceeding 640 acres of stock-raising homestead lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 15735) to amend the Foreign Service buildings act, 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15736) to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign

commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 15737) to reserve 920 acres on the public domain for the use and benefit of the Kanosh Band of Indians residing in the vicinity of Kanosh, Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 15738) to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the District of Columbia in force December 2, 1928; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 15739) to provide a 1-cent postage rate on local letters and expedite the handling of that class of mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 365) authorizing the President, under certain conditions, to invite the participation of other nations in the Chicago World's Fair, providing for the admission of their exhibits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 366) authorizing the appropriation of the sum of \$871,655 as the contribution of the United States toward the Christopher Columbus Memorial Lighthouse at Santo Domingo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LA GUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 367) providing for the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on cornstalk paper; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 368) providing more economical and improved methods for the publication and distribution of the Code of Laws of the United States and of the District of Columbia, and supplements; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 281) directing an investigation of the payment and expenditure of money by international bankers, United States international business organizations, and their legal representatives, and foreign interests, to create a public opinion in the United States favorable to the United States joining the League of Nations, adhering to the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations, and to the acceptance of the multilateral treaty by the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 15740) granting a pension to Alpha Jewett Atterberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 15741) granting a pension to George M. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15742) granting a pension to Mary J. Toomey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15743) granting an increase of pension to Isabel Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15744) granting an increase of pension to Mary Catherine Kuppenheffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 15745) to correct the military record of George W. Churchill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15746) granting an increase of pension to Eveline Weekly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15747) granting an increase of pension to Matilda A. Stoops; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15748) granting a pension to Charles W. Thurston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 15749) granting a pension to Mary C. Gallagher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15750) granting a pension to Clara E. Moor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15751) granting a pension to Anna Steele; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15752) for the relief of Jeannette Weir; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15753) for the relief of George Selby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15754) for the relief of John S. Stotts, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 15755) for the relief of John Bedard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15756) for the relief of David Fleming; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 15757) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Booth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15758) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Van DeBogart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 15759) granting a pension to John E. Wingo; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15760) for relief of C. F. Wigton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15761) to place Norman O. Ross on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15762) granting a pension to Chloe M. Ranbarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15763) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Hartzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15764) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Butner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15765) granting an increase of pension to Vernon L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15766) for the relief of St. Ludgers Catholic Church, Germantown, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 15767) granting an increase of pension to Huldah Deavers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15768) granting an increase of pension to Alice Araminta Ogborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 15769) to pay certain claims, heretofore reported to Congress by the Secretary of War, arising from the explosions and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co., at Morgan, N. J., October 4 and 5, 1919; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 15770) granting an increase of pension to Theda Elder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 15771) granting a pension to Amelia McCray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15772) granting the distinguished-service medal to Capt. Albert B. Randall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 15773) granting a pension to Louis Webber; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15774) granting a pension to Isabelle Herley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15775) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Coats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 15776) granting a pension to Lydia A. Crouch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 15777) granting a pension to Etta May Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15778) granting a pension to Alice Geiger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15779) granting an increase of pension to Isabelle Woodworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15780) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Seltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15781) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Staggers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15782) granting an increase of pension to Georgia Harsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15783) granting an increase of pension to Lusina Clouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15784) granting an increase of pension to Mary Burdick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15785) granting an increase of pension to Addie B. Arver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15786) for the relief of Josiah J. Hostetler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 15787) granting a pension to Sarah Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 15788) granting an increase of pension to Rosella Leighton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 15789) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Thomas Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15790) granting an increase of pension to Mary Demott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 15791) granting a pension to Vonny A. McClaren; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 15792) granting an increase of pension to Emma Satterthwaite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15793) granting an increase of pension to Martin A. Hellwig; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15794) granting a pension to Ellis B. McNeeley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 15795) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Shadle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 15796) granting a pension to Isabella H. McIntyre; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 15797) granting a pension to John E. Stringer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15798) granting a pension to Louisa C. Redding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15799) granting an increase of pension to Irene Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 15800) granting a pension to George W. Kane; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 15801) granting a pension to Esther E. Boardman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15802) granting a pension to Olive H. Kline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15803) granting a pension to John D. Shutts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 15804) granting a pension to Hettie Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 15805) granting a pension to Catherine Whitmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15806) granting a pension to Robert Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15807) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 15808) for the relief of Levi H. French; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15809) to authorize a preliminary survey of Mud Creek, in Kentucky, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 15810) granting a pension to Myrtle Millington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15811) granting an increase of pension to Sallie A. Hollister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 15812) granting an increase of pension to George Curry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 15813) granting an increase of pension to Melville M. Gordon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15814) granting a pension to Mary A. Crosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15815) granting a pension to Robert H. Hays; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15816) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15817) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Ashurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 15818) granting a pension to John Wroblewski; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15819) granting a pension to Peter F. Van Auken; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15820) granting a pension to David L. Wiltgen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15821) granting a pension to Lillian Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15822) for the relief of Rose Lea Comstock; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 15823) granting an increase of pension to Anna C. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 15824) granting an increase of pension to Richard E. Goldner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 15825) granting an increase of pension to Angeline S. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15826) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Moorehouse; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 15827) granting a pension to Armina Besaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15828) for the relief of Capt. Herbert Baldwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 15829) for the relief of Ira W. Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15830) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Alford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15831) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. McAfoos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15832) granting an increase of pension to Annie S. Aul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 15833) granting a pension to Lizzie Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15834) granting a pension to Walker Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 15835) for the relief of William O. Hart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 15836) for the relief of Miriam E. Benjamin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15837) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 15838) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15839) granting an increase of pension to Maude Howard Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 15840) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Packer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15841) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 15842) granting an increase of pension to Frances V. Aspy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 15843) granting an increase of pension to John J. Weir; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 15844) granting a pension to Rachel L. Morris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 15845) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Boen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 15846) granting a pension to Alice Wisener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15847) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia S. Lakin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Resolution (H. Res. 280) to pay Fred R. Miller for extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8091. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Hollywood Camp No. 83, United Spanish War Veterans, of Hollywood, Calif., favoring additional hospital facilities at the Soldiers' Home, Pacific Branch, Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8092. Also, petition of executive board of the Los Angeles District, California Federation of Women's Clubs, protesting against the resurvey of the north line of the Hoopa Indian Reservation and the adjacent lands as executed by Francis E. Joy, and that it be rejected and declared to be of no further force or effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

8093. Also, petition of Chas. E. Clark Camp, No. 78, United Spanish War Veterans, Inglewood, Calif., favoring additional hospital facilities at Soldiers' Home, Pacific Branch, Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8094. By Mr. GARBNER: Petition of Dr. B. F. Wooding, Washington, D. C., urging support of House bill 10594; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8095. Also, petition of the Southwestern Game and Fish Conservation Association, urging support of the Norbeck migratory bird refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8096. Also, petition of the Mid-Central Fish Co., Kansas City, Mo., indorsing House Joint Resolution 303, to amend the Hoch-Smith resolution to include the product of fisheries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8097. Also, petition of the Middle Atlantic Fisheries Association, New York City, indorsing House Joint Resolution 303, to amend the Hoch-Smith resolution to include the product of fisheries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8098. Also, petition of Milo E. Hendrix Camp, No. 4, United Spanish War Veterans, and the Ladies Auxiliary to the camp, Department of Oklahoma, Muskogee, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 14676; to the Committee on Pensions.

8099. Also, petition of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, protesting against any unusual appropriations for naval expansion; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8100. Also, petition of the directors of the Okmulgee Chamber of Commerce, Okmulgee, Okla., requesting opposition to legislation having as its purpose the elimination of the Pullman

surcharge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8101. Also, petition of the Consolidated Flour Mills Co., Wichita, Kans., indorsing House bill 15267, a bill to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8102. Also, petition of General Harrison Gray Otis Post, No. 1537, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 6523; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8103. Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, urging support of the convict labor bill (H. R. 7729) as amended by the Senate; to the Committee on Labor.

8104. Also, petition of Robert Newberry, Laverne, Okla., indorsing the plan of flood relief through the impounding of the waters in the tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

8105. Also, petition of William H. Ruller, McAlester, Okla., urging amendment of the Pittman-Newton recapture bill to render protection to the small railroad lines of the State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8106. Also, petition of the Nordic Seafood Co., Tulsa, Okla., urging support of House Joint Resolution 303 to amend the Hoch-Smith resolution to include the products of fisheries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8107. Also, petition of C. J. Turpin, president and general manager of the Beaver, Meade & Englewood Railroad Co., urging support of the Pittman-Newton recapture bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8108. Also, petition of the Oklahoma Division of the American Association of University Women, indorsing the Gillett resolution and the Kellogg-Briand multilateral treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8109. Also, petition of Concordia Mercantile Co., Concordia, Kans., indorsing House Joint Resolution 303, to amend the Hoch-Smith resolution to include the products of fisheries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8110. Also, petition of E. N. Puckett, manager Union Equity Exchange, Enid, Okla., urging the enactment of farm-relief legislation during this second session of the Seventieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8111. Also, petition of John Manley, general manager of the Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Association, Enid, Okla., expressing approval of House bill 15267, a bill to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8112. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of W. T. Stockton, president of First National Bank of Kerens, Tex., and M. L. Speed, manager of the M. L. Speed Hardware Co., of Kerens, Tex., indorsing Senate bill 4689; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8113. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of citizens of Colfax County, opposing House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8114. Also, petition of citizens of Clayton, N. Mex., protesting against House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8115. Also, petition of citizens of Maxwell and Clayton, N. Mex., opposing House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8116. Also, petition of citizens of Maxwell, N. Mex., opposing House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8117. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of J. G. Phelps Stokes, 100 William Street, New York City, favoring the passage of Senate bill 3623; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8118. Also, petition of the Nevada Central Railroad Co., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3623; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8119. Also, petition of the Standard Wholesale Phosphate & Acid Works, Baltimore, Md., opposing the passage of legislation to place a duty on disease-free seed potatoes imported from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8120. Also, petition of the Guaranty Co. of New York City, N. Y., favoring additional appropriations to the Postmaster General to enforce the postal fraud laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8121. Also, petition of the General Harrison Gray Otis Post, No. 1537, Pasadena, Calif., favoring the passage of House bill 6523; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8122. Also, petition of the Medical Society of the County of Kings, State of New York, opposing the passage of the Newton

bill (H. R. 14070); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8123. Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring the passage of House bill 7729 as amended by the Senate; to the Committee on Labor.

8124. Also, petition of E. F. Drew & Co. (Inc.), New York City, opposing the passage of the Haugen bill (H. R. 10958); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8125. By Mr. QUAYLE: Petition of Medical Society of the County of Kings, protesting against the passage of the Newton bill (H. R. 14070); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8126. Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, favoring amendments to the laws through which to clothe the courts with power adequately to punish all parties found guilty of the charge of theft and pilferage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8127. Also, petition adopted by the board of directors of the Maritime Association of New York, protesting against the refusal of the United States Shipping Board to pay brokerage commission on coal fixtures; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

8128. Also, petition by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in favor of the convict labor bill (H. R. 7729), as amended by the Senate; to the Committee on Labor.

8129. Also, petition of the Nevada Central Railroad Co. of New York, in favor of the passage of Senate bill 3623; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8130. Also, petition of the Illinois Valley Protective Association, Peoria, Ill., urging the passing of Senate bill 4689 and House bill 14116; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8131. Also, petition of J. G. Phelps Stokes, of New York City, urging the passage of Senate bill 3623; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8132. Also, petition of Ed S. Vail Butterine Co., of Chicago, Ill., opposing the passage of the Haugen bill (H. R. 10958) to amend the definition of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8133. By Mr. TILSON: Resolution favoring an immediate revision of the tariff law of 1922, adopted by group of several hundred business men, representing all branches of business and all sections of Connecticut, at Hartford, on December 27, 1928, as arranged by the Connecticut Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8134. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions adopted by the St. Brendan Society at the December meeting on the racial origins clause of the immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 4, 1929

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1929)

The Senate met in open executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent to present a proposed amendment to Senate Resolution 287, introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], with a request that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask that the clerk may read the proposed substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read, as requested. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. EDGE to Senate Resolution 287, viz: Substitute for the resolution the following:

Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate the operation and enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and the national prohibition act

Resolved, etc., That on and after April 1, 1929, the President of the United States is authorized to appoint a special commission of nine citizens to investigate the operation and enforcement of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States and the national prohibition act and all laws supplementary thereto. The commission is authorized and directed to organize and make a searching investigation of the system and methods of the enforcement of said amendment and laws and of the facts relating to and the causes responsible for the admitted general violations of such laws; to determine the best means and methods for correcting the situation with respect to prohibition; and to submit its report, with any recommendations desired, to the President at as early a date as practicable, but in no case later than January 1, 1930.

SEC. 2. The commission is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such experts and clerical help, and to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere) as may be necessary for the purposes of this resolution. For the purposes of this resolution there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$50,000 to be expended by the commission and to remain available until expended. All expenditures of the commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman. For the purposes of this resolution the commission or any member thereof is authorized to hold hearings, administer oaths, examine witnesses, and issue subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of books, papers, documents, or other evidence, or the taking of depositions before any designated individual competent to administer oaths. All governmental establishments in the executive branch of the Government are directed to furnish the commission with such available information and data as the commission may request and to otherwise cooperate with the commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

As in legislative session,

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of Pittsfield, Mass., praying for the prompt ratification of the so-called Kellogg multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented the petition of Rev. James H. Tate and sundry other citizens of Fluvanna, Tex., praying that the preamble of the Constitution be amended by including therein the words "devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the Savior and King of Nations," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Ulm, Minn., praying for the adoption of Senate Resolution 242, providing for an inquiry as to the appropriateness of amending article 231 of the treaty of Versailles for the purpose of establishing the World War guilt, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. EDGE presented a communication from Mary Patterson Shelton, president of the Leonia (N. J.) Women's Republican Club, transmitting resolutions adopted by that club favoring the policy of immigration restriction, the maintenance of the national-origins quota system, and adequate measures for the national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

CONSTRUCTION OF CRUISERS

Mr. DENEEN. I present resolutions adopted by the Chicago Association of Commerce, in favor of the passage of House bill 11526, to authorize the construction of 15 light cruisers and 1 airplane carrier. I ask that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

December 18, 1928.

HON. CHARLES S. DENEEN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DENEEN: I am requested by the executive committee of the Chicago Association of Commerce to invite your attention to the following resolution adopted Friday, December 14, 1928:

"Whereas the President of the United States in his message to Congress has called attention to the deficiency of the Navy in the matter of cruisers, and has recommended the passage of legislation designed to correct that deficiency; and

"Whereas there is pending in the Senate a bill, H. R. 11526, which has passed the House of Representatives, to authorize the construction of 15 light cruisers and 1 airplane carrier, which measure it is understood has the support of the administration: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Chicago Association of Commerce approve, endorse, and recommend the early enactment of this bill; and be it further

"Resolved, That the president of the association be authorized and requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, and the members of the Illinois congressional delegation."

Thanking you for giving this matter consideration, and with the compliments of the season,

Very sincerely yours,

WM. R. DAWES, President.

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, I offer an address by Mrs. Henry W. English, of Jacksonville, Ill., upon George Rogers